

# MEDIAEVAL STUDIES

*Volume L*

1988



PONTIFICAL INSTITUTE OF MEDIAEVAL STUDIES  
TORONTO, CANADA

*Editor:*

Professor Virginia Brown

© 1988 by

Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies  
59 Queen's Park Crescent East  
Toronto, Ontario  
Canada M5S 2C4

This volume has been published with the help  
of a grant from the Social Sciences  
and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

ISBN 0-88844-652-7  
ISSN 0076-5872

*Printed by*  
*UNIVERSA—WETTEREN—BELGIUM*



## CONTENTS

J. Reginald O'Donnell, C.S.B. (1907-1988)	<i>J. Ambrose Raftis</i>	vii
<i>Mediaeval Studies Fifty Years After</i>	<i>Joseph Owens</i>	xi

### TEXTS

<i>Quaestiones</i> concerning Christ from the First Half of the Thirteenth Century: V. <i>Quaestiones</i> from Douai ms. 434: Christ's Knowledge	<i>Walter H. Principe</i>	1
A Critical Edition of the Anti-Arsenite Discourses of Theoleptos of Philadelphieia	<i>Robert E. Sinkewicz</i>	46
Thirteenth-Century Teaching on Speech and Accentuation: Robert Kilwardby's Commentary on <i>De accentibus</i> of Pseudo-Priscian	(†) <i>P. Osmund Lewry</i>	96
The Univocity of the Concept of Being in the Fourteenth Century: II. The <i>De ente</i> of Peter Thomae	<i>Stephen D. Dumont</i>	186

### ARTICLES

Siger of Brabant and Theology	<i>Armand Maurer</i>	257
Thomas Aquinas: Dimensive Quantity as Individuating Principle	<i>Joseph Owens</i>	279
The Land Market at Godmanchester c. 1300	<i>J. Ambrose Raftis</i>	311
<i>Ocelli nominum</i> : Names and Shelf Marks of Famous/Familiar Manuscripts (III)	<i>Wilma Fitzgerald</i>	333
Oleg Svyatoslavich and His Patronage of the Cult of SS. Boris and Gleb	<i>Martin Dimnik</i>	349
The Beginnings of English Administration in Ponthieu: An Unnoticed Document of 1280	<i>John Carmi Parsons</i>	371
St. Thomas Aquinas and the Profession of Arms	<i>Edward A. Synan</i>	404
Berkeley, University of California, Bancroft Library ms. 2 (notes de lecture)	<i>Édouard Jeaneau</i>	438

Theory and Practice: Marriage of the Unfree and the Poor in Medieval Society	<i>Michael M. Sheehan</i>	457
The Apostolic See and the Elections of the Bishops of Perugia in the Duecento and Trecento	<i>Giulio Silano</i>	488
Dated and Datable Manuscripts Copied in England during the Ninth Century: A Preliminary List	<i>Jennifer Morrish</i>	512
Armchair Pilgrims: Ampullae from Aphrodisias in Caria	<i>Sheila D. Campbell</i>	539
A Greek Slave in Majorca in 1419-26: New Documents	<i>J. N. Hillgarth</i>	546
The <i>alia littera</i> in Thomas Aquinas' <i>Sententia libri Metaphysicae</i>	<i>James P. Reilly, Jr.</i>	559
<i>Miscellanea beneventana</i> (IV)		
1. A Second New List of Beneventan Manuscripts (II)	<i>Virginia Brown</i>	584
2. A South Italian Liturgico-Canonical Mass Commentary	<i>Roger E. Reynolds</i>	626

## MEDIAEVALIA

Further Astronomical Material of Abbo of Fleury	<i>Ron B. Thomson</i>	671
---	-----------------------	-----

THE FELLOWS AND ASSOCIATES  
OF THE  
PONTIFICAL INSTITUTE OF MEDIAEVAL STUDIES  
DEDICATE  
THIS VOLUME  
TO THE MEMORY OF  
J. REGINALD O'DONNELL, C.S.B.



## J. REGINALD O'DONNELL, C.S.B. (1907-1988)

*J. Ambrose Raftis, C.S.B.*

James Reginald O'Donnell, C.S.B. died on 5 February 1988 at the Basilian Fathers Residence in Toronto. He had been taken to hospital two weeks earlier; given his weakened condition and history of heart problems, doctors rejected corrective surgery and he returned to the Basilian Fathers Residence where his health, but not his spirits, deteriorated rapidly. A Mass of Christian Burial was concelebrated at St. Basil's Church, Toronto on 9 February. The President of the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies was the homilist.

James Reginald O'Donnell was born on 19 August 1907 near Jarvis, Ontario, Canada. After elementary education in local schools and two years at St. Jerome's College in Kitchener, Ontario, he entered St. Michael's College in Toronto. O'Donnell was received into the Congregation of St. Basil in 1928 and ordained priest on 21 December 1932 by Bishop Alexander MacDonald in St. Basil's Church.

By the time of his ordination, Father O'Donnell's variety of talents for both languages and philosophy as well as his immense capacity for hard work had become well known to his academic advisers. This led to his selection as one of the founding staff members of the fledgling Institute of Mediaeval Studies. To this end he studied from 1933 to 1935 at Cracow, Breslau, and the École Pratique des Hautes Études and École des Chartes, Paris. After returning to Canada he joined not only the Institute but also the Department of Classics of the University of Toronto. In 1946 he obtained his doctorate in philosophy from the University of Toronto.

From the mid-1930s on Father O'Donnell's numerous Latin and Greek classes, his rigorous seminars in palaeography and the edition of texts, and his application of the methods of traditional classical scholarship to mediaeval sources became the heart of the Licentiate Programme of the Pontifical Institute. The collection of manuscript catalogues, studies and facsimiles which he assembled and constantly enlarged was both basis and impetus for the Institute's present extensive holdings in this area. His vigorous role in the Department of Classics, which he further served as Secretary in his younger years and as Acting Chairman in 1961-62, was in accord with his firm belief that the entire classical heritage constituted a foundation for enhancing the understanding of Christian culture. His acquisition

for the Institute library of a complete set of Pauly-Wissowa's *Real-encyclopädie* (with future supplements) as a gift from the German government is only one concrete instance of this conviction.

In his teaching he never lost touch with the high standards of his European mentors – Clovis Brunel, Alphonse Dain, Josef Koch and Charles Samaran – and occasionally found it difficult to transmit the same commitment to the more pragmatically minded students of a later age. It is said that an oral examination by Father O'Donnell was an event not easily forgotten. Despite this almost legendary academic severity his courses attracted students from the Departments of Classics, English, History and Philosophy as well as from the Institute itself. He was involved in the supervision of nearly a hundred doctoral theses, all with a vigilant eye; their authors (who were later grateful to him and became his friend) soon came to realize that he could never be persuaded to deviate from his own vision of scholarship.

At the same time, Reginald O'Donnell insisted upon a continually changing approach to the study of mediaeval culture. For this reason he broadened the Licentiate Programme to include the training in diplomatics required by the growing number of historians in the 1960s. Under his energetic and imaginative direction the Institute microfilm collection grew rapidly to become a major and often irreplaceable depository of manuscript and archival materials. This same creative genius led to his cooperation with the late Professors Peter Brieger and Bertie Wilkinson in forming the Centre for Medieval Studies of the University of Toronto. The establishment of the Toronto campus as the premier place for mediaeval studies in North America owes much to Reginald O'Donnell who was tireless in developing its various resources, facilities and programmes even after his retirement from teaching in the spring of 1971.

His publications cover the entire classical tradition from the earliest Christian Hellenism to the flowering of mediaeval philosophy and Renaissance intellectual life. This broad range is also reflected by his penetrating book reviews in such diverse journals as *The Catholic Historical Review*, *Isis*, *Latomus*, *The Modern Schoolman*, *The New Scholasticism*, *Phoenix*, *Speculum*, and *The Thomist*. He will be best remembered by the scholarly world for his critical editions of Themistius, Nicholas of Autrecourt and William of Sherwood. But the dry, scientifically rigorous *apparatus* of these Latin texts does not convey adequately his liveliness of intellect, which was open to questions of a philosophical, theological or philological nature. On rare occasions he wrote about these issues as, for example, in a seminal essay on the influence of Calcidius, the third-century translator of Plato. Another such instance was his address to the Royal Society of Canada when he chose to ask the ageless question 'What has Athens to do with Jerusalem?'. The answer was the blending of philosophy and religion characteristic of the Middle Ages.

Father O'Donnell had a dignity about his person that was unmistakeable, as well as a seriousness and originality of mind and the courage to state his views forthrightly. He was unwavering in his standards for intellectual discussion and debate. While he did not pretend to sit in judgment on his fellow scholars, he fully succeeded in conveying to them his own high ideals. His tenure of the editorship of *Mediaeval Studies* from 1970 to 1974 was notable for the practical application of these ideals.

Reginald O'Donnell's reputation as a world-class scholar was recognized by his election as a Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada in 1960, a Canada Council Senior Fellowship held at Florence and Rome in 1960-61, a Fellowship to the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton in 1968-69 and such post-retirement honours as an honorary doctorate in 1979 on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies.

Much of what has been noted above might not seem unexceptionable in the career of an academic. But the career of James Reginald O'Donnell begs for more attention. At first muster this would seem to appear almost as a series of paradoxes: the demanding taskmaster with whom former students shared warm, lifelong friendships; the meticulous and possibly over-cautious publishing scholar who supervised a large number and variety of research theses; the jealous defender of a tightly structured programme in mediaeval studies who was responsible for bringing to the Pontifical Institute many staff members of diverse talents and interests. Upon deeper reflection, however, these are not paradoxes but indications that the life of James Reginald O'Donnell can only be fully written as a chapter in the history of an institution.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

##### A. Books

1. (ed.) *Nine Mediaeval Thinkers: A Collection of Hitherto Unedited Texts* (Studies and Texts 1; Toronto, 1955).
2. (ed.) *Mediaeval Studies* 33 (1971).
3. (ed.) *Mediaeval Studies* 34 (1972).
4. (ed.) *Mediaeval Studies* 35 (1973).
5. (ed.) *Mediaeval Studies* 36 (1974).
6. (ed.) *Essays in Honour of Anton Charles Pegis* (Toronto, 1974).

##### B. Articles

7. 'Nicholas of Autrecourt', *Mediaeval Studies* 1 (1939) 179-280.
8. 'The Syncategoremata of William of Sherwood', *Mediaeval Studies* 3 (1941) 46-93.

9. 'The Philosophy of Nicholas of Autrecourt and His Appraisal of Aristotle', *Mediaeval Studies* 4 (1942) 97-125.
10. 'The Meaning of "Silva" in the Commentary on the *Timaeus* of Plato by Chalcidius', *Mediaeval Studies* 7 (1945) 1-20.
11. 'Tractatus Magistri Guillelmi Alvernensis *De bono et malo*', *Mediaeval Studies* 8 (1946) 245-99.
12. 'Tractatus secundus Guillelmi Alvernensis *De bono et malo*', *Mediaeval Studies* 16 (1954) 219-71.
13. 'A Manuscript of the "De philosophiae consolatione" of Boethius, in the Royal Ontario Museum (No. 951.153)', *Royal Ontario Museum. Bulletin of the Division of Art & Archaeology* 24 (1956) 10-13.
14. 'Themistius' Paraphrasis of the Posterior Analytics in Gerard of Cremona's Translation', *Mediaeval Studies* 20 (1958) 239-315.
15. 'A Fifteenth Century Book of Hours-Missal', *Mediaeval Studies* 21 (1959) 296-303.
16. 'Coluccio Salutati on the Poet-Teacher', *Mediaeval Studies* 22 (1960) 240-56.
17. 'The Sources and Meaning of Bernard Silvester's Commentary on the Aeneid', *Mediaeval Studies* 24 (1962) 233-49.
18. 'Le reflet de l'enseignement de la philosophie dans la religion', *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 4th Ser., 1 (1963) 41-50.
19. 'Joseph Thomas Muckle (1887-1967): An Obituary', *Mediaeval Studies* 29 (1967) v-vii.
20. 'The Commentary of Giles of Rome on the Rhetoric of Aristotle' in *Essays in Medieval History Presented to Bertie Wilkinson*, ed. T. A. Sandquist and M. R. Powicke (Toronto, 1969), pp. 139-56.
21. 'The Liberal Arts in the Twelfth Century with Special Reference to Alexander Nequam (1157-1217)' in *Arts libéraux et philosophie au Moyen Age. Actes du Quatrième Congrès international de philosophie médiévale, Université de Montréal, Montréal, Canada, 27 août-2 septembre 1967* (Montreal, 1969), pp. 127-35.
22. 'Alcuin's Priscian' in *Latin Script and Letters, A.D. 400-900. Festschrift Presented to Ludwig Bieler on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*, ed. J. J. O'Meara and B. Naumann (Leiden, 1976), pp. 222-35.
23. 'The *Rhetorica Divina* of William of Auvergne' in *Images of Man in Ancient and Medieval Thought. Studia Gerardo Verbeke ab amicis et collegis dicata*, ed. F. Bossier et al. (Louvain, 1976), pp. 323-33.

#### C. Translations

24. 'Desiderius Erasmus, *The Paraclesis: An Exhortation to the Study of Christian Philosophy*' in A. C. Pegis, ed., *The Wisdom of Catholicism* (New York, 1949), pp. 519-30.
25. 'Francis Petrarch, *Letter to Denis of Borgo-San Sepolcro*', *ibid.*, pp. 444-52.
26. 'Prosper of Aquitaine, *Grace and Free Will (De gratia dei)*' in *The Fathers of the Church* 7 (New York, 1949), pp. 333-418.



## MEDIAEVAL STUDIES FIFTY YEARS AFTER

*Joseph Owens, C.Ss.R*

As *Mediaeval Studies* rounds out its first half century of publication, it may well feel the need of a quick backward glance at its original objectives. From the earliest days of the Institute that had been inaugurated at Toronto in 1929, printed outlet for its scholarly work loomed large in the plans of its most insistent promoter, Étienne Gilson. For him, aware as he was of the difficulties in getting medieval research into print in Europe, provision for publication at the new Institute of Mediaeval Studies was of the highest priority. It was regarded as the necessary incentive for prompting lifelong commitment of scholars to these studies. It would be the visible guarantee that their devoted and exacting labours would not end up as private scholarly exercises. Assurance of publication was the keystone that would hold everything else in place in the projected structure. It was the final block that would give solidity and permanence to the whole undertaking, and it was something utterly imperative for attracting staff and students, thereby ensuring the future of the newly founded Institute.

But all the other components had to be in place before the keystone could be raised. The difficult and protracted organization of staff, library, students, academic programmes and policies, together with financial arrangements and the efforts to attain recognized ecclesiastical and academic standing, filled the opening years of the Institute's history. Yet shortly before the announcement (11 November 1936) of the initial pontifical recognition of the Institute as set up in accord with the then approved statutes, the minutes of the faculty meeting on 20 October of that year were able to report: 'Assurance was given that the Institute was prepared to publish any worthwhile article or study submitted by a professor, provided that it satisfied the critical judgment of two members of the staff.' Work of the professors only was specified in this assertion. Further, 'the advisability of making a definite contract for the printing of the Texts and Studies of the Institute was discussed' (*ibid.*). On 4 October 1937 the president reported that the contract with an American firm had been signed. The publications were to be in four series: (1) '*Mediaeval Studies*, an occasional review'; (2) the edition of medieval texts; (3) studies in the medieval field; (4) translations. Those professors preparing papers for the first volume of *Mediaeval Studies* were given the close deadline of 15 November.

From these early discussions it is clear enough that *Mediaeval Studies* was intended to be but one among other means of publication for the work of the Institute, and that the frequency of its appearance was left vague in its description as 'an occasional review', as though each issue was to appear as contributions became available. The only contributors explicitly envisaged for it were the professors.

The next meeting (8 November 1937) of the Institute's faculty decided that *Mediaeval Studies* would not carry book reviews. This decision strongly emphasized the thrust of the new journal towards original research. From that viewpoint the prohibition was well warranted, but its bar on ordinary reviewing of other publications in the field would hardly seem to accord with the title 'Review'. The meeting also extended the deadline for the first issue to 1 February 1938. Bothersome realities of deadlines and details of getting a volume through the press were being encountered early by the incipient journal. Nevertheless, on 7 February 1938 the minutes reported that the first volume was ready for press, and on 7 March 1938 the printing of 500 copies was authorized. A sense of urgency seemed felt since the faculty voted to decline the offer of a slightly lower price if the printing could be postponed until the summer. However, the offer seems to have been kept in mind for the next volume, because the minutes on 14 December 1938 reported that 'material enough would be available for summer printing'.

According to the minutes of 7 March 1938, the Finance Committee had decided that 'it would be unwise to set the price above \$5.00, since that is the usual figure for quarterly reviews of this type.' This is at least a hint that the originally recorded notion of 'occasional' publication had allowed a frequency greater than once a year, and that the model of a 'Review' still hovered over the discussions. Actually, when the first volume appeared (1939), the introductory letter from the Chancellor presented it as 'an annual collection of studies and researches', with the trust that it 'may soon develop into the establishment of a quarterly review.' Nevertheless, according to the recollections of the still surviving members who were present at these early meetings, there was, with acknowledgment of and allowance for initial gropings, only one dominant conception of the projected journal, namely, that of a regularly appearing annual publication. The minutes, however, continue to speak as though dates were not fixed: '1 July was set tentatively as the date for submitting material for the next volume of *Mediaeval Studies*' (9 January 1939); 'It was agreed that work should go on as though a new number were to appear in the near future' (2 October 1939); 'The make-up of the next volume of *Mediaeval Studies* was discussed, when it became apparent that there is now sufficient material available for a new volume' (19 February 1940). Only with the 1943 issue did *Mediaeval Studies* have enough experience of itself and confidence in itself to state on the back of its title-page 'Published Annually', and at the staff meeting on 26 January 1944 'next year's *Mediaeval Studies*' was

the phrasing used. In point of fact, there has been one volume for every year from 1939 on.

The first volume of *Mediaeval Studies* illustrated in actual fact the type of publication envisaged. The opening item was a discussion article by Gilson on a modern view (Brentano's) of medieval philosophy. A study by G. B. Phelan of a basic metaphysical topic in Aquinas followed; this was an article that continued to be read and cited in Thomistic circles throughout the ensuing decades. Then came editions of texts with concomitant discussion by V. L. Kennedy and A. J. Denomy in their respective fields of Christian worship and vernacular literature, with discussions in patristics by J. T. Muckle and in medieval canon law by T. P. McLaughlin. Finally, the last third of the volume was taken up with a philosophical text of Nicholas of Autrecourt, edited by J. R. O'Donnell, to whose recollections the present account of the origin and growth of *Mediaeval Studies* is heavily indebted.

There is no reason to doubt that this was, in general outline and relative distribution, the type of issue desired at the time for the periodical. Edition of texts was markedly predominant, and the contributors were all professors of the Institute. The location given to the two discussion articles at the beginning of the volume need not indicate anything more than place of honour for the two eminent scholars who since 1936 had been titled respectively the Institute's Director and its President. But the assignment of nearly equal space to discussion articles shows that balance of these two types of contribution was intended from the start.

With the second volume, articles by other than staff members began to appear. One was by a student at the Institute. Student contributions continued in the immediately succeeding volumes, and came to be included directly in the journal's objective. Later this policy was expressly stated in the assertion that 'the journal gave first preference to articles from the staff and students' (9 March 1974), and somewhat more widely in giving 'top priority to articles containing research done on the Toronto campus' (10 November 1973). Yet contributions from scholars not officially connected with the Toronto campus continued to increase, with the result that the present editor saw fit to urge 'a return to our journal's original ideal of publishing the research done on the Toronto campus, especially by the Fellows and Associates of the Institute' (8 February 1975). The present anniversary volume with articles solely by the Institute staff is a thoughtful token gesture of homage to the project as originally conceived.

In somewhat parallel fashion the proportion of articles to texts changed rather noticeably. The second volume (1940) maintained roughly the same proportion. But in succeeding volumes the discussion articles came to predominate, though always some texts were included. One Managing Editor, in fact, made no secret of his preference for articles. Gilson, on the other hand, maintained that texts were what sold the journal. Deliberate efforts were made to correct the imbalance. From

1975 on, the opening section of each issue was given over to 'Texts', displayed prominently under that title. Further, helps for medieval studies, such as the lists of Latin translations and of manuscripts drawn up by J. T. Muckle and R. J. Scollard for the 1942 volume, came to be included. Works of this type later became a separate category of publication, under the caption 'Subsidia mediaevalia', apart from *Mediaeval Studies*. Another type of contribution named 'Mediaevalia', consisting of shorter articles or notices on points of medieval interest, was introduced in 1946 and still continues. There is some recollection of a requirement that any advertising accepted by the journal should be 'dignified'. Actually, the only advertising carried (1948, 1949, 1953, 1956, 1957 and from 1959 on) has been of the Institute's own publications and appears in unobjectionably sober format. The ban on general advertising is quite in conformity with, and perhaps implied in, the policy of not carrying book reviews. However, the minutes have no mention of a prohibition on the acceptance of advertising.

In its early years, *Mediaeval Studies* had no individual editor. In practice the academic secretary of the Institute, V. L. Kennedy, looked after the details of publication, with the other professors responsible for material in their own areas. On his resignation from the office of academic secretary, for health reasons, Father Kennedy asked to be 'relieved of all duties connected with the publication and the distribution of *Mediaeval Studies*' (letter of 15 September 1943). To meet this approaching resignation, a 'special office' of 'Managing Editor' had been proposed, though with the acknowledgment that 'in principle the staff as a whole is editor' (7 September 1943). A. J. Denomy was accordingly appointed to 'the newly established office of Managing Editor of *Mediaeval Studies*' (6 December 1943). Not until 9 May 1964 was Denomy's successor, T. P. McLaughlin, formally given the title 'Editor', actually the title that corresponded to the work entailed. Under that title his successors, first J. R. O'Donnell and then Virginia Brown, carried on the supervision of the journal. The precedent, however, that the supervision was shared originally by the professors as part of their regular duties was not lost, for on Father Denomy's sudden death (1957) it reverted to staff members without formal nomination. V. L. Kennedy and A. A. Maurer were thanked (8 February 1958) for seeing volume 19 through the press. J. C. Wey reported on the journal at the meeting on 20 February 1960, and A. A. Maurer on 4 November 1961 as well as on 6 January 1962. With that year the journal came under the sole supervision of T. P. McLaughlin, who had been 'unanimously elected' to the office at the meeting of 4 November 1961. He was already quite informally referred to as its editor. When the publications of the Institute had been brought under a uniform title of 'Studies and Texts' (5 March 1955; cf. 15 January 1955), *Mediaeval Studies* was expressly exempted, and with the setting up of a Department of Publications (2 December 1962), a Director of Publications (9 May 1964) and a Committee on Publications (6 February 1965) the journal remained outside their

jurisdiction. The Editor was responsible directly to the Institute Council. Assurance of editorial independence for *Mediaeval Studies* was thereby guaranteed, with liaison provided (6 March 1965) by membership of the Editor on the Committee.

With increase in circulation the journal has grown in size, from somewhat less than 300 pages an issue to 500 pages or more. On 13 December 1958 800 copies for the current issue were authorized to be printed, 1000 on 8 October 1960, and an overly optimistic 2000 on 7 October 1967. In practice, however, the circulation has levelled off at around 1400, a figure which also reflects the number of copies now printed. Indexes for the journal appear in separate volumes at suitable intervals. The printing was done in the United States until 1941, from 1942 until 1958 in Canada, and from 1959 on in Belgium. Volume 20 (1958) was dedicated to Gilson to mark his seventy-fifth birthday, and several other volumes have been inscribed to the memory of deceased staff members. While the overwhelming number of articles have been in English and French, quite understandably in view of the fact that these are Canada's two official languages, the journal has been open from the start to contributions in German, Italian, Spanish and Latin, and to texts in Greek. Though genuinely open to the international academic community, it has been unremitting in its efforts to promote Canadian scholarship.

Fifty years after, in this backward glance, *Mediaeval Studies* can see much for which it may well be grateful. It has attained and kept the status of a first-class scholarly journal, largely by reason of the professional competence and untiring labors of its editors and contributors. From 1977 on its worth has been recognized in grants from The Canada Council and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for new volumes, and for some reprinting of early volumes to make up complete sets. Its original objectives seem untarnished. The President's Report of 1962-63 showed that staff participation had fallen as low as twenty-five percent and twenty-six percent in a couple of the issues, though the overall percentage for the staff contributions up to that date was just slightly less than for the non-faculty papers. That Report seemed to regard this percentage as 'a reasonable distribution' through the first twenty-four volumes. A later reassessment, called for on 9 November 1974, 'visualized the periodical as a learned journal covering all aspects of medieval studies, and one open to medievalists throughout the world, though first choice was to be given always to contributions from the Fellows (and Associates) of the Institute' (8 February 1975). In still more recent issues staff, Associate, campus and former student contributions have been high in proportion of space in the journal. The overall picture emerging from these Reports is probably correct. Excellence is the decisive standard, regardless of the provenance of the contributions. In all other considerations flexibility is in order. Throughout its first fifty years *Mediaeval Studies* has been feeling its way in actual practice towards the attainment of its ideal. It will continue to do so. Cross-fertilization through non-staff contributions, and the ecumenical spirit of sharing

mutually the fruits of scholarship in ever varying manners as the situation demands, may well be the hallmark of success.

Would the founders of *Mediaeval Studies* agree? They were men of strong and incisive thinking, each conditioned by his own background. Eye to eye convergence would be too much to expect. But they were men of balanced judgment. They would realize the need of adaptation to developing surroundings and tolerance for aspects they would find unwelcome. All in all, one may feel confident they would see that the torch thrown from their hands was still being held high. *Mediaeval Studies* has undoubtedly fulfilled the purpose of its founders in providing a readily accessible resource collection for scholars. The editing and publication of the 272 texts that comprise more than thirty percent of its volumes sufficiently attest this achievement. Likewise its 832 discussion articles, in the wide range of research and interpretative reflection covered by their nearly 600 authors, notably enhance and facilitate scholarly work throughout the commonly recognized disciplines in the medieval field.

*Q*UAESTIONES CONCERNING CHRIST  
FROM THE FIRST HALF OF THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY:

V. *Q*UAESTIONES FROM DOUAI MS. 434:  
CHRIST'S KNOWLEDGE\*

*Walter H. Principe, C.S.B.*

MANUSCRIPT 434 at the Bibliothèque de la Ville at Douai contains four *quaestiones* dealing with Christ's knowledge, especially his human or created knowledge, a topic frequently discussed in the first half of the thirteenth century.<sup>1</sup> Palémon Glorieux's description of the Douai manuscript lists these *quaestiones* as numbers 78, 424, 444, and 492.<sup>2</sup>

\* Research for this series and for other studies was made possible by Leave Fellowships from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada in 1975 and 1982, and by a Theological Scholarship and Research Grant from The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada in 1978. I should like to express my gratitude to the Council and the Association for this help.

The previous articles in this series are found in *Mediaeval Studies* 39 (1977) 1-59 (*quaestiones* from Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale mss. lat. 3454, 3572, 3804A, 3549, 15571), 42 (1980) 1-40 (*quaestiones* from Douai, Bibliothèque de la Ville ms. 434, on the need of the Incarnation and the defects assumed), 43 (1981) 1-57 (*quaestiones* from Douai 434, on the Hypostatic Union), 44 (1982) 1-82 (*quaestiones* from Douai 434, on Christ as Head of the Church and on the unity of the Mystical Body).

<sup>1</sup> Studies of Christ's knowledge in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries include the following: Arthur Michael Landgraf, 'Das Wissen der Seele Christi' in his *Dogmengeschichte der Frühscholastik* 2.2 (Regensburg, 1954), pp. 44-131; Laurence S. Vaughan, *The Acquired Knowledge of Christ according to the Theologians of the 12th and 13th Centuries* (Rome, 1957); William J. Forster, *The Beatific Knowledge of Christ in the Theology of the 12th and 13th Centuries* (Rome, 1958); John C. Murray, *The Infused Knowledge of Christ in the Theology of the 12th and 13th Centuries* (Windsor, Ont., Canada, 1963); Johannes Theodorus Ernst, *Die Lehre der hochmittelalterlichen Theologen von der vollkommenen Erkenntnis Christi: Ein Versuch zur Auslegung der klassischen Dreiteilung: Visio beatifica, scientia infusa und scientia acquisita* (Freiburger Theologischen Studien 89; Freiburg, 1971) (with extensive bibliography).

<sup>2</sup> See his 'Les 572 Questions du manuscrit de Douai 434', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 10 (1938) 135, 234, 236, and 240 respectively.

I. THE *QUAESTIONES* EDITED AND ANALYZED HERE*Question 1 (no. 78) (Anonymous)*

This question is found in volume 1, fol. 62vb, of the manuscript.<sup>3</sup> It is written in hand *m*, the hand of the person who organized and ordered the manuscript, and is listed by Glorieux as anonymous.<sup>4</sup>

*Question 2 (no. 492) (Anonymous)*

As will become clear from internal evidence to be presented in our study, this question, numbered 492 by Glorieux, and the following question (number 424: our question 3), are the work of the same author, with number 424 following number 492 and depending on it. Hence the sequence of questions in the manuscript will be reversed for examination of these two questions. This question (number 492) is found in volume 2, fols. 144vb-145va (pp. 294b-295a according to the numbering followed by Glorieux at this point).<sup>5</sup> It is written in hand *m*<sup>8</sup> and is listed as anonymous by Glorieux.<sup>6</sup>

*Question 3 (no. 424) (Anonymous)*

Our third question, numbered 424 by Glorieux, is in volume 2, fols. 74vb-75rb.<sup>7</sup> It is written in hand *m*<sup>8</sup> of the manuscript; Glorieux lists it as anonymous.<sup>8</sup>

*Question 4 (no. 444) (Anonymous)*

Our fourth question, found in volume 2, fols. 90vb-91va, is numbered 444 by Glorieux. Written in hand *m*<sup>5</sup> of the manuscript, the text contains many inaccuracies and a few self-corrections. Glorieux lists it as anonymous.<sup>9</sup>

Except for the common authorship of questions 2 and 3 (numbers 492 and 424, which order must be followed because of internal references), our study has found no relationship among the various questions edited here.

<sup>3</sup> See Glorieux, *ibid.*, 135.

<sup>4</sup> For the hand see *ibid.*, 134 n. 22; for the listing as anonymous see *ibid.*, 264; for *m* as organizer of the manuscript see *ibid.*, 151-152. As is often the case with hand *m*'s exposition, this question is rather brief and sketchy.

<sup>5</sup> See *ibid.*, 240.

<sup>6</sup> For the hand see *ibid.*, 239-40 n. 44; for its anonymity, see *ibid.*, 265.

<sup>7</sup> See *ibid.*, 234.

<sup>8</sup> For the hand see *ibid.*, 230-31 n. 38; for the question as anonymous see *ibid.*, 265.

<sup>9</sup> For the numbering and incipit and explicit, see *ibid.*, 236; for the hand see *ibid.*, 230-31; for the anonymity of the question see *ibid.*, 265. Glorieux wondered if this hand is different from *m*<sup>8</sup>; I am convinced that they are indeed different hands: see *Quaestiones* III, in *Mediaeval Studies* 43 (1981) 3 n. 10.



## II. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF THE CONTENTS OF THE QUESTIONS

The four questions edited here fit into the developing analysis of Christ's human knowledge as seen in the third and fourth decades of the thirteenth century. As the studies already referred to indicate, discussions in the twelfth and earlier thirteenth century centred on topics such as whether Christ's human knowledge was equal to his divine knowledge: if not, whether he grew in knowledge as he advanced in age; if so, whether this implied that he was omnipotent; whether there was a modal difference, or a difference of clarity, between Christ's divine and human knowledge; whether Christ had experiential knowledge; whether he had a knowledge of inquiry or of reasoning; whether he had beatific knowledge while on earth. Considerable advance and refinement had already been made by authors such as Praepositinus, Stephen Langton, Godfrey of Poitiers, William of Auxerre, Alexander of Hales, and Hugh of St. Cher. It is within the context of their discussions that the questions edited here take their place.

### *Question 1 (no. 78): On Christ's created knowledge (Anonymous)*

Commenting on Luke's statement that Jesus advanced in wisdom, a text of Bede found in the *Glossa ordinaria* holds that Jesus' rational soul advanced in wisdom and grace as his body advanced in years (1). But against this it is argued that what is full cannot be increased and what is true cannot vary. Since Christ had a fullness of grace and truth, he could not increase or advance in wisdom or truth (2).

The two replies of the respondent are obscure because of their brevity. The first reply refers the statement of the *Gloss* to the 'condition of human nature' (3). This cryptic remark is clarified by a text from the *Glossa interlinearis* based on Cassiodorus' *Exposition of the Psalms*: 'The truth of human condition is shown forth.' In other words, the text of the *Glossa ordinaria* is interpreted by our author as saying that Christ's growth in wisdom and grace shows the reality of his human nature.

The second reply refers to an 'equivocation of the copula'. It says that this equivocation is allowed in scripture, and so one can speak of 'God and man' (4). What this may mean is that 'God and man' is equivocal in the sense that one can say of Jesus, who is God and man, that he advanced in knowledge as man but not as God.

A second topic appears at once. If Christ as man knows all that the Father knows, is he not equal to the Father as a knower? (5) But against this is a text of Lombard's *Gloss* on Ps 138:6, which says that Christ as man cannot be equal to God, not even in knowledge (6).

The master replies at first by saying that Christ could be equal to the Father in knowledge as to the number of things known, but not in the clarity of knowledge possessed by the Father (7). But this reply is opposed by an argument saying that

Christ not only knew the same number of things as the Father but that he knows the clarity of knowledge possessed by the Father. Hence Christ's knowledge is entirely equal to the Father's (8). To this the master replies that even if Christ knows that clarity (i.e., as an object of knowledge), he does not know it by the same clarity as the Father's (9).

A new kind of comparison of Christ's knowledge with his Father's knowledge seeks to show that Christ knew how to create and how to justify. A first argument holds that because Christ knows by speculative knowledge whatever the Father knows, he must also know by practical knowledge whatever the Father knows since speculative knowledge is more noble than practical knowledge (i.e., the argument means, the nobler must include the less noble). Hence, the argument concludes, Christ must have known how to create and how to justify others (10). A second argument adds that since he is equal to the Father in knowing, he must be equal to the Father in power (11).

The master's reply is again brief and cryptic. Power does not lead to beatitude as knowledge does (12). This seems to mean that in this life Christ had to have beatitude and therefore had to be endowed with special knowledge that was in some ways equal to that of the Father. But equal power would not have been required for Christ's beatitude and therefore it was not given to him. This interpretation seems to be supported by a statement further on which says that without knowledge Christ 'would not have fruition' (17).<sup>10</sup>

Another topic now enters. Christ assumed bodily defects in order to redeem the body. Should he not also have assumed defects of soul so as to redeem the soul (13)? The defect of soul meant by this argument is undoubtedly a certain lack of knowledge. The master replies, however, that if Christ lacked perfect knowledge, he would be unhappy (14); again, for this theologian beatitude, and therefore perfect knowledge in Christ's earthly life, is an essential requisite.

The next two arguments maintain that Christ needed no new perfection in addition to that which he received from the beginning from the Deity. His bodily glorification, it is said, added nothing to the perfection he had from the beginning (16); this seems to prepare the way for the next argument, which says that, since Christ had perfect knowledge of all things from the Deity, he had no need for created knowledge to be added to this knowledge (17). It is no answer, the argument continues, to say that Christ's soul could not perceive the uncreated knowledge: as scripture says, the Divinity dwelt in Christ's soul bodily. This means that the Divinity dwelt in Christ's soul through its essence, through indwelling grace, and through union. With this indwelling, however, goes illumination

<sup>10</sup> William of Auxerre was the first to make this link between Christ's human omniscience and his need of it for beatitude. See Forster, *Beatific Knowledge* (above, n. 1), p. 28, and Murray, *Infused Knowledge* (above, n. 1), p. 31.

through knowledge. Therefore, even if there were no created knowledge in Christ, the Deity illumined the soul of Christ with uncreated knowledge (17).

The master's reply is the one we have seen before: without (created) knowledge, Christ would not have fruition, that is, beatitude (17). The presence of uncreated knowledge would, it seems, not beatify Christ's human nature, which would need its own proper created beatifying knowledge.

The next argument is a dialectical attempt to show the illogical result of saying that Christ had created knowledge. Created knowledge would be predicated of Christ's human nature without qualification (*simpliciter*), and this would mean that, simply speaking, Christ had knowledge by a lesser knowledge (the created knowledge) than he had previously (by the uncreated knowledge). Therefore, the dialectical argument concludes, he knew less than he did before (18)—an absurd conclusion that negates the idea of Christ having created knowledge.

The master finds little difficulty in replying to this argument. Christ, he says, has the same knowledge he had before and, in addition, the created knowledge. Hence he does not know less than formerly (19).

But someone who acquires additional money is richer than before having it, says a new argument. So someone having one knowledge and then acquiring another knowledge of the same things known is more knowing (*scientior*) than formerly (20). The master replies that such a person is richer by reason of an increase of habits (of knowledge) but is not more knowing by reason of an increase of things known; the increase comes only from a new mode of knowing (21).

A final exchange turns on goodness and loveableness. As Christ (by taking human nature) is less than himself (i.e., as God), so he is less knowing than himself (i.e., as God), and therefore he is less to be loved than before. In every aspect he is to be considered as less than before his Incarnation (cf. 22). A counterargument says that after the Incarnation Christ is to be loved more since there are now several causes for loving him: he is now not only Creator but also Redeemer (23).

The master asserts in conclusion that Christ is not to be loved less than formerly; rather (and in this he seems to pick up the idea of what is likely his own counterargument), the reason for loving Christ is conflated from many kinds of goodness (in Christ) (24).

### *Summary*

This brief question holds that Christ's human knowledge was equal to the Father's in that he knew humanly all the things the Father knows but did not know them so clearly as the Father. The increase in wisdom and grace spoken of in Luke's gospel was simply apparent; it was meant to show forth the truth and reality of Christ's human nature. Following the lead of William of Auxerre, the author says that this knowledge was required for Christ's beatitude while on earth; on the

other hand, omnipotence was not so required and hence arguments that Christ should have been humanly omnipotent lack force. The need of this knowledge for beatitude also prevented his assuming defects of soul (such as ignorance) to redeem the souls of others.

Against the argument that the indwelling Divinity would illumine Christ's soul and thus render human knowledge unnecessary, this author again appeals to the need of human knowledge for the beatitude of Christ's human nature. This human knowledge does not enrich Christ's knowledge as God, but does add a new mode of knowing to him. Christ is to be loved more rather than less by reason of the Incarnation since by it he becomes Redeemer, and this is a new cause of his loveableness.

*Question 2 (no. 492): On Christ's knowledge (Anonymous)*

In this examination of Christ's knowledge two questions are listed before the master answers either. The first concerns the existence or not in Christ of a new acquired habitus of knowledge during his earthly existence; the second asks whether Christ's knowledge of a thing through the medium of the Word is identical with his knowledge of the same thing in himself. The summary here will give the master's reply to the first problem before presenting the second.

(a) *Was there in Christ a new acquired habit of knowledge?*

An opening exchange arises from the text of Luke saying that Jesus advanced in age and wisdom. Does this not indicate an advance in knowledge? (1) No, says the master: it indicates that knowledge did not advance in Christ himself but only according to the opinion of others or for their edification (2); this is a familiar western patristic theme maintaining that Christ only appeared to grow in knowledge for the sake of appearing human or to help others. But, pursues the opponent, Christ really advanced in age and therefore he really advanced in the wisdom or knowledge associated with age in the Lucan text (3).

Another argument quotes at greater length the text of Bede seen in our first question (1) about Christ advancing in wisdom and grace proportionately to his advance in age. The fuller text here adds from Bede that, as God, Christ receiving this knowledge had no need of it since he is described as already having been full of wisdom. But Christ did choose to receive it for our salvation so that, since flesh and a rational soul were taken up by God, each was equally saved by God. From Bede's gloss on the Lucan text, it is argued, one can prove that, if he advanced in age, he likewise advanced in wisdom (4).

Another argument distinguishes knowledge *propter quid*, proceeding from cause to effect, from knowledge *quia*, proceeding from effect to cause. The latter, the source of acquired knowledge, would have been in Christ since Christ saw things

as did other human beings, and so Christ, like others, would have a knowledge generated from his examination of things (5).

Again, suffering and pain in the senses beget a new experience. And since Christ thirsted and hungered, some new habit must have grown in him (7). A similar argument could be made from the grasp of forms through the senses: from the senses, changed by the sensed object, a similitude would flow into 'opinion' (the author likely makes this equivalent to imagination), and this similitude, further purified, would pass into the intellect, thereby giving rise to a new acquired habit in Christ from his examination of things (8). The same conclusion follows from the fact that Christ saw some man or other whom he had not seen before (9).

All these arguments start from the principle that Christ, human like others, must have had a truly human way of knowing, with the conditions of human knowing that include the acquisition of new habits of knowledge.

The master counters these arguments by relying on ideas that he says come from Augustine but that reflect later adaptations or clarifications of Augustine's thought. Using a phrase, 'the mirror of eternity', which appeared only in the Middle Ages, he says that the soul of Christ was united to the 'mirror of eternity' and that in this or in its exemplar were contained sensible things as well as intelligibles. Hence, just as Christ's soul knew or received intelligible things in that mirror, so he knew or received sensible things. Since he thereby knew sensible things as well as intelligibles, no new knowledge came to him (from his earthly experience) (10).<sup>11</sup>

A second text, said to be of Augustine,<sup>12</sup> is then quoted, which compares Christ's soul united to God with iron placed in fire. Implying that the iron shares the properties of the fire, the comparison leads to the conclusion that Christ's soul shares divine knowledge of sensible and intelligible things. Hence from Christ's examination or experience of things no sensitive knowledge was generated (11).

After presenting opening arguments about the second question, the master answers those already seen concerning the first question. Taking together all the arguments based on the text from Luke and the *Gloss* (1, 3, 4), he replies to them by quoting the final part of its text, which says clearly, as he insists, that Christ did not become wiser in time since he was full of the spirit of wisdom from the first moment of his conception; his increase in wisdom spoken of by the *Gloss* refers to his gradual demonstration to others of the fullness of wisdom he possessed from the beginning (16).

To this reply he adds the summary of a text from John Damascene interpreting the growth in age, knowledge, and wisdom as a manifestation of the wisdom

<sup>11</sup> On the 'mirror of eternity' see the note to our edition of q. 2, ll. 34-35.

<sup>12</sup> In our texts several statements about Christ's knowledge are attributed to Augustine but, as can be seen from the studies (with texts) referred to in the preceding note, they are too explicit to be Augustine's own statements even if, in some cases, they draw on Augustinian ideas in general and apply them to Christ.

inhering in Christ's soul. He then quotes another section of Bede's gloss to interpret the section quoted at the beginning: the progression in wisdom and grace according to Christ's advance in age refers to his increasing manifestation of these to others (17).

To the argument that Christ acquired experiential knowledge through his thirst, hunger, etc. (7) the master replies that he will treat this more fully later (18). This discussion is quite certainly that given in our question 3. At this point he agrees that Christ did acquire experiential knowledge and, to show his agreement, he quotes a gloss on Hebrews saying that Christ learned from what he suffered. But, he says, this implies no accretion of knowledge in Christ, as texts from the *Gloss* (on Jeremiah) and from Damascene indicate (18).

The master's lengthiest discussion comes in his reply to the argument about the psychology of acquired knowledge, which had spoken of a similitude or likeness passing from sense through opinion into the intellect and thereby producing a new habit of knowledge (8). The master replies with an interesting analysis of sense knowledge, the interior sense powers, and their relations to the intellectual powers of a human subject. His basic position is that sensitive knowledge can be understood properly and improperly. Apprehension by exterior senses is called sensitive knowledge only improperly. Christ did have such apprehensions daily in his exterior senses, and, if sensitive knowledge is taken in this improper sense, Christ did acquire sensitive knowledge. But sensitive knowledge, properly speaking, is found in the power of common sense, in which the exterior senses are made perfect as to both knowledge and judgment. It is called 'common' because of its perfecting all the exterior senses in itself; it is like a point terminating several lines in itself. Common sense allows us to say that something white is also sweet, a knowledge unavailable to exterior sense. This kind of sensitive knowledge, understood properly as the functioning of common sense, was not acquired in Christ (19).

What of the opponent's analysis of the passage of a likeness (called *idolum* by the master in his reply) through the interior senses to Christ's intellect? (8) The master replies that all the interior powers of Christ were complete in their habits: by reason of his soul's union to the Son of God, his intellect, imagination, *phantasia*, and common sense were all complete. Only his external senses were incomplete in that they could be changed by external sensation. In that respect, he admits as before, some new apprehension took place in Christ's external sense, but the image (*idolum*), passing into common sense, remained there. The master illustrates his position by the example of a sleepwalker who saddles his horse: in this case the person's intelligence influences the imagination, the imagination the *phantasia*, and *phantasia* the common sense, but this influence of the intelligence does not pass into the exterior senses, so that these are not used by the sleepwalker. Applying this to Christ in a kind of inversion, the master says that the likeness of

something that changed his senses did not go any further since his interior powers were complete in their habits (of knowledge) (20). Although the example is not developed adequately, the master implies that the completeness of habits and superior powers is so dominant in Christ that his new external sensations did not pass through these powers to form new habits of knowledge.

Finally the master develops his previous position when he responds to the argument that Christ learned something when he first saw Peter (9). It is true that on seeing Peter for the first time Christ's eye was changed by a new form (this would be the exterior sense spoken of before), but he had already seen him with an interior vision and knew him. The bible elsewhere gives an example of this: Eliseus declared that, though absent from the scene, he had seen his servant Giezi receiving money from Naaman (21).

(b) *Was Christ's knowledge of a thing through the medium of the Word identical with his knowledge of the same thing in himself?*

This question presupposes that Christ's soul saw and knew all things both in the mirror of the Word to which it was united and in itself when it turned towards itself. Are the two knowledges the same, it is asked? It would seem that they are not, one argument runs, because an angel's knowledge of things in the Word (called morning knowledge) differs from its knowledge of things in itself (called evening knowledge), and the same should be true of Christ (12).<sup>13</sup>

Moreover, no knowledge is clearer (*limpidior*) than itself, says another argument. But Christ's soul had a much clearer knowledge of things in the Word than it had of things in itself. Therefore the two knowledges differ (13).

The next two arguments maintain that there must have been not only two but several types of knowledge in Christ because he had several kinds of created knowledge. He had one created knowledge according to the grace of union and another, like that of a glorified soul, by which he saw all things in the Word; hence he had at least two kinds of created knowledge (14). In fact, says the next argument, he had five kinds of knowledge, one his uncreated knowledge as God and four created kinds of knowledge: one according to the grace of union, another as *comprehensor* like that of the blessed, a third by which he saw things intellec-

<sup>13</sup> The analysis of Christ's knowledge with reference to the Augustinian theme of *cognitio matutina* and *cognitio vespertina* is a frequent theme in theologians in the period of our questions. In fact, Ernst, *Lehre* (above, n. 1) entitles his whole third chapter, dealing with authors from William of Auxerre to the *Summa fratris Alexandri*, 'Das Modell "cognitio matutina-vespertina": von der Angelologie und Protologie zu der Christologie' (pp. 97-129). Although this is a valuable insight and a good organizing principle, Ernst tends to stress it so much as to leave out many other aspects of the discussions of Christ's knowledge, as can be seen from the questions edited here and from the studies of Forster, Murray, and Vaughan.

tually in their own genus, and a fourth by which he sensed things in their own genus (15).<sup>14</sup>

The master at first gives no solution to the question as originally posed (12). He begins his replies to the arguments by briefly insisting that there is only one knowledge in Christ, that is, he says, created knowledge (22): here he must be referring to one created knowledge in the soul of Christ and rejecting the series of arguments that held for more than one created knowledge in Christ. In the next reply he elaborates his position with regard to the argument that knowledge coming from the grace of union and knowledge like that of the blessed meant two kinds of knowledge (14; cf. 15). He holds that Christ did have such knowledge but that the two kinds distinguished by the opponent are identical as knowledge; what are different are the diverse things known. The soul of Christ, as united by the grace of union, knew the mysteries of the Incarnation; as *comprehensor* like blessed souls, he knew things pertaining to created and uncreated beatitude; as someone sharing our human condition, he knew things pertaining to human beings. By the same created knowledge he knew these diverse objects of knowledge, but his created knowledge and the knowledge of a glorified soul are of the same species (23). The final statement is somewhat unconvincing since it neglects finally the question about knowledge related to the grace of union, a knowledge he admits but that is not found in glorified souls.

The master does not reply directly to the argument about differences in clarity of knowledge (13); when speaking of differences in clarity, he states the argument as a comparison of Christ's created knowledge with that of other glorified souls, a comparison which concludes that Christ's knowledge, being infinitely clearer than that of any glorified soul, must be different in kind from that of the blessed (24). In a sense, this argument takes up the conclusion of his previous reply, where he maintained that Christ's created knowledge is the same in species as that of a glorified soul. He replies to this argument by comparing knowledge with charity. The charity of those in heaven will be infinitely greater than that of those (the same persons?) on earth, and yet, he says, it will be the same charity

<sup>14</sup> In his *Glossa in Sent.* 3.13.10c (AE), edd. Patres Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 3 (Quaracchi, 1954), pp. 131-32, Alexander of Hales lists five kinds of knowledge in Christ, the first three of which correspond exactly to the first three mentioned by our author; Alexander's fourth and fifth kinds likewise correspond to the fourth and fifth kinds mentioned here, but the description is somewhat different. The fourth kind (the 'third mode' of *human* knowledge) 'fuit secundum integritatem naturae quam recepit ab Adam; et sicut Adam cognitionem habuit de omnibus quae facta sunt propter ipsum, sic et Christus' (p. 132); the fifth kind was 'secundum naturam poenalem quam suscepit; et sic per experientiam scivit quae prius non per experientiam scivit' (ibid.). In his *Quaestiones* Alexander subdivides the last kind into two modes, affective experience and cognitive experience: see his *Quaestiones disputatae 'antequam esset frater'*, q. 42.16, edd. PP. Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 2 (Quaracchi, 1960), p. 718.



in heaven as it was on earth (24). This is meant to account for differences in clarity between Christ's knowledge and that of the blessed, but again the example seems to limp.

Finally, perhaps in reference to the argument that Christ had a created sensitive knowledge that would be another kind of created knowledge (15), the master says that Christ had experiential knowledge with respect to pain. Experiential knowledge, however, has two elements, he explains: there is knowledge in the faculty of common sense and there is an attack (*infectio*) on the exterior sense. Christ acquired experiential knowledge (*scientia experimenti*) from this attack on the senses, but he did not acquire cognitive knowledge (*cognitio*) (25). In this distinction between *scientia experimenti* and *cognitio* one senses a certain embarrassment in the master. Having admitted a growth in one kind of knowledge, he changes his terminology to avoid saying there was a real growth in knowledge. Earlier, to be sure (19), he had equated such exterior sense knowledge as experiential knowledge with an improper as opposed to a proper understanding of sense knowledge, and this is undoubtedly the way his terminology here must be interpreted.

### Summary

In summary, then, the master maintains firmly that the human created knowledge in Christ never increased from the fullness and completion it had from his first moment of conception. Christ simply adapted the manifestation of this complete knowledge to the appropriate times of his human physical growth. His new sensations or 'apprehensions' by sense knowledge remained in his senses, the light from his intellect and interior sense powers providing such complete knowledge even of sensible things that these new sensations could be said only improperly to have been knowledge at all; thus one cannot speak of an increase of knowledge in Christ. Christ's created knowledge is of only one kind: the grace of union and his state of *comprehensor* (like the blessed in heaven) give him knowledge of different objects but not different kinds of knowledge. The master's examples, used to illustrate his positions or to persuade his opponents, seem in several instances to be inadequate to the question.

### *Question 3 (no. 424): On Christ's experiential knowledge (Anonymous)*

This question discusses three topics concerning Christ's human knowledge. Did Christ by this knowledge know everything actually at the same time? Does this knowledge confer omnipotence on Christ's soul? How does it compare with his uncreated knowledge? (1)<sup>15</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Our summary of this par. 1 follows the actual order of the second and third subquestions in the manuscript rather than the order given in par. 1.

(a) *Did Christ know everything actually at the same time?*

Two opening arguments maintain that Christ advanced in or acquired new knowledge humanly, so that he did not know all things actually at the same time. A text of Bernard, the first says, maintains that Christ learned by experience in time what he knew from the beginning. But 'to learn' implies an act of moving from not knowing to knowing, and, since he had this act of learning, Christ came to know something he did not know before. Hence he did not know everything from the moment of his conception (2). The second argument uses the example of a blind man unable to judge about colours without the use of his senses. So Christ could not judge colours before he had sense faculties or the use of his senses. Hence (when he had these) he acquired knowledge (3).

Two arguments take the opposite view. A text of Augustine saying that the glorified souls of the blessed in heaven have equal knowledge whether their eyes are open or not is applied to Christ, who on earth had the knowledge of the blessed (he was a *comprehensor*, the text says). Opened eyes means presence of sensing and closed eyes the absence of sensing. Since Christ saw all things before having senses or sensing (the moment of conception seems to be meant), he did not have experiential knowledge (4). The second argument is a more general one: from the moment of Christ's creation God the Father gave his soul every good it was able to receive, and since experiential knowledge is a certain good, the Father gave this to Christ at that moment (5).

In his solution the master refers to what he has already said elsewhere (in our question 2) and he now says it 'immutably': the soul of Christ, exalted above the nature of other souls, had in its knowledge a different order from ours. Our knowledge begins from the senses and passes into the imagination. Christ's knowledge, on the contrary, begins from the intelligence, which in him was complete from the beginning of the creation of his soul. From there it passed into his *phantasia*, which was again complete, and from there into his common sense, which was completely filled with all forms; finally, it passed into the individual senses and the particular forms, all of which it had complete in his common sense from the very beginning. Therefore the particular senses were joined to common sense, just as many lines are joined to a point without anything thereby accruing to the point (6). In all this we have a repetition of the master's teaching that has already been seen.<sup>16</sup>

Although Christ passed from inexperience to experience, it does not follow, the master says in reply to the first argument (2), that he acquired experiential knowledge and therefore acquired knowledge. What has already been said suffices to reject this conclusion (7). Here our author is referring either to the solution just

<sup>16</sup> See q. 2, pars. 19-20.

given or to his preceding question.<sup>17</sup> New sensations for Christ are not an acquisition of new knowledge since all knowledge was already present in all his interior knowing faculties and these acquire no new knowledge in and from the new sensations.

The quotation from Augustine about the blessed in heaven is now examined. It had been used to conclude that Christ had no experiential knowledge, but the master, who does hold for experiential knowledge in Christ, although without increase of knowledge, corrects the use of the text in one respect. Those in heaven, he says, do not see all things 'with open eyes' (which had been explained as the presence of sensing, and here is interpreted as *sub sensu*, that is, through sensing). In heaven the blessed do not have sensation of all things (8). This cryptic reply is meant to be applied similarly to Christ: he did not see all things from the beginning: we recall that in the previous question (2, par. 21) the master had agreed that Christ saw Peter after not having seen him. Hence he did have an experiential knowledge.

The master gives a double reply to the argument that, since experiential knowledge is a good thing, Christ received it from the Father' from the very beginning of his creation (5). For those who say that a habit is acquired through experiential knowledge, he maintains that in the case of Christ that habit was always present. His second reply is that Christ had every good that is not 'diminished', that is, that signifies no imperfection. Christ had every non-diminished good but not those, such as the good of faith, that are diminished because of an element of imperfection indicated in them (9). This double reply handles the question of experiential knowledge in Christ from both angles. If experiential knowledge is a perfection as a habit, Christ had the perfection of the habit at all times even if he had individual sensations of experiencing things; if it involves imperfection, it is not one of those goods the Father should have given him from the beginning. In the latter case, new sensations and new experiences could take place but without actual increase of knowledge.

Within this first subquestion a further problem is raised. In his knowledge of all things Christ knew them either by turning himself above himself (that is, to the Word, which will be called the 'Mirror' of all things) or by turning himself towards the things that are known. Did he, then, know things by several likenesses or only by one? One view would say that he knows things by several likenesses since the likeness of one thing differs from that of another. But another view would say that it is by the same likenesses that Christ is turned towards the Mirror (of the Word) and towards things. But since his turning to the Mirror is by one likeness and in

<sup>17</sup> See q. 2, pars. 18, 21, 25.

one respect, his turning towards things will likewise be by one likeness and in one respect, and not by many likenesses (10).

The master prefers the second of these alternatives. Although the reasons (*rationes*) of things are many, Christ's knowledge, which is in him by one habit of knowledge, is not multiplied but is one in his understanding of things that are as different in reasons as an ass and a man. The master compares the knowledge in Christ's soul in this respect to God's knowledge of all things. Each is by one knowledge that knows all things simultaneously. The difference is that God knows in this way as cause of all things whereas Christ is not cause of all things (11).

Having given this response, the master reflects on the various modes of knowing, using the method of concatenation frequently found in authors of this period. The natural order of knowledge, he says, is to 'know one thing through one' or 'many things through many'. Between these extremes are knowledge of one thing through many and knowledge of many things through one. To know one thing through one (medium) is found in God; the second of the four ways, to know one object (God) through many media (vestiges of God in creatures), is found in us, as is knowing many things through many media (the fourth way and the extreme opposite to God's way). The remaining third way, knowing many things through one medium, is found only in Christ and in angels. Christ's one habit or form of knowledge, given him by God from the beginning of his creation, enables him to know all things (11). In the following paragraph the master adds in passing that the habit or form by which Christ knew all things was not the (Holy Spirit's) gift of knowledge (*scientia*), for by this gift one knows only the knowable objects of the particular gift whereas Christ's habit or form made his intellect most perfect (12). This overall view is interesting, but its first extreme (knowing *unum per unum*), seen as God's way of knowing, might require some elucidation since it could raise doubts about God's knowledge of different species and of individuals.

The next discussion compares Christ's knowledge and love. Since Christ's knowledge of all things was perfect, it is suggested, so too was his love for all things, and so he loved all things by charity (12). The master finds this reasoning unacceptable. It is here that, as has just been seen, he distinguishes Christ's form or habit of knowledge from the special gift of knowledge. He does so because he wants to compare charity, as a gratuitous and meritorious habit, to the Holy Spirit's gift of knowledge. Because charity has this quality, it extends, like the gift of knowledge, only to its specific objects and hence 'it was not necessary for [Christ] to love all things by charity'. It sufficed for him to love all things by a natural love. An interesting and somewhat curious inversion of argumentation follows: because Christ loved all things and could not love them if he did not know them, it follows that he knows all things (13). The master seems to suggest as a further proof of Christ's omniscience the greater certitude that he loved all things; this being so,

he must have that knowledge of all things that has already been seen in other ways.<sup>18</sup>

Was Christ's knowledge of all things simultaneous and actual (and not only potential), it is asked? (14) How could it be so when things themselves exist successively (and not simultaneously)? Christ's experiential knowledge of successively existing things must itself have been successive (and potential in part) and not simultaneous and actual (15).

The master replies by giving in his own words Augustine's doctrine on the knowledge possessed by the blessed in heaven. According to the master's summary, Augustine says that this knowledge will be complete and clear, without succession of likenesses in knowing, and adds that 'perhaps all our thoughts will be simultaneous' (16). The master does not deal with the argument concerning Christ's experiential knowledge of things existing successively. We could infer that since he has already said that this type of knowing does not effect any changes in Christ's common sense or other interior knowing faculties, the successive experience of successively existing things makes no real difference to Christ's knowledge; for the master, certainly, it does not increase or change the human knowledge of Christ.

(b) *Did Christ have omnipotence as well as omniscience?*

An opening argument to prove that Christ had omnipotence begins from the Boethian definition of beatitude as involving possession of all goods. But if power were lacking because of weakness, that would impede beatitude even more than would a lack of goodness. Hence, the argument continues, power promotes beatitude even more than goodness, and so Christ as man should have had omnipotence as well as omniscience (17). Implied in the whole argument is the master's view that Christ's knowledge was like that of the blessed in heaven.

Further, says a second approach, does not the image of God shine forth in Christ as man or in his soul with respect to power no less than regarding knowledge? And so, if Christ was omniscient, he ought to have been and be said to have been omnipotent (18).

In his reply rejecting this conclusion, the master proceeds from the notion of omnipotence, which, he says, implies both being from oneself and being able of oneself to do all things. If one had being or power from another, that other would be better and one would not be omnipotent. Applying this to Christ, he says that whereas knowledge, as a perfection of the soul, contributes to beatitude, power

<sup>18</sup> As the notes to our edition indicate at this point, the argument derives from Anselm's *Cur Deus homo*.

does not, and so Christ received knowledge but not omnipotence (19).<sup>19</sup> The argument from the notion of omnipotence is not altogether clear: the master seems to mean that Christ as human has his being and power from God and so cannot be omnipotent. But this does not impede his beatitude since power is not an intrinsic perfection of the soul but relates the person to other persons or things.

This implication is stated clearly in the master's second argument: no creature can have the essential elements of omnipotence, being and power from itself, and since Christ's soul is a creature, he is not omnipotent (20).

(c) *A comparison of the knowledge in Christ's soul with his uncreated knowledge*

This discussion opens with the comment that, since Christ's soul knew all things, his created knowledge was not surpassed by his uncreated knowledge. The fact that it was created and so differed from his uncreated knowledge points to the cause of its existence but not to any superiority (*excessus*) of the uncreated knowledge. Nor did a difference in their mode affect the issue, for his created knowledge had no mixture of any contrary ignorance; here the disputant forestalls a possibly different answer by asserting that he is speaking not of any possibility of mixture but of the actual clarity of the knowledge (21). Besides, the opponent adds, what common element do the two knowledges have whereby they could be compared as superior and inferior? (19)

The master in his reply concentrates on what his fellow disputant had asked about the element of mixture, saying that in the knowledge had by the holy souls in heaven there is no mixture (*permixtio*) of lack of knowledge (*nescientia*) or ignorance (*ignorantia*). But, he goes on, there could be a second kind of lack of mixture (*impermixtio*), that is, the removal of any receptivity (*passibilitas*) on the part of the receiver. Since the holy souls can continue to grow in knowledge until the day of judgment, this receptivity is still present in them and so there is some kind of mixture there. A third lack of mixture would take place if there were no union or 'conjoining with that Mirror' (that is, the Word). Although Christ had neither of the first two kinds of mixture (nescience or ignorance; passibility or receptivity of new knowledge), he had the third in that he *was* united or joined to the Mirror of the Word for his created knowledge. And so, although Christ's created knowledge was the clearest among all created knowledges, it was less clear than his uncreated knowledge (23).

What does the master mean when he says that being joined to the Mirror involves a mixture? He is contrasting the self-identity of the Word and Christ's

<sup>19</sup> Although this topic was debated frequently in the twelfth century, William of Auxerre seems to have been the first to argue that Christ did not have omnipotence because it does not pertain to beatitude. See Forster, *Beatific Knowledge* (above, n. 1), p. 30.

uncreated knowledge (as Word) with the need of Christ's human soul for union with the Word in order to have the exalted knowledge it receives — exalted indeed but still less perfect than the uncreated knowledge he has in his divine nature.

As to the opponent's question about a common element of comparison between the two knowledges, the master says the uncreated and created knowledge have it in common that they know all things. They can then be compared: God knows all things as cause in himself of them, whereas Christ's soul knows them without being their cause in himself, and in this the uncreated knowledge exceeds or surpasses the created. Perhaps to support his view that there is some real common sharing in the two knowledges, the master adds that the sharing is proportional because they share in a certain effect, namely, knowing all things. That he is applying the notion of analogy or proportionality (both terms were used at this time) is clear from his example: uncreated and created justice do not communicate in or share a common essence but they do so in their effect, which is to render to each person what is his or her due (24). With this reply the question ends.<sup>20</sup>

### *Summary*

In this question the master reiterates what he has said in question 2 about the superiority of Christ's knowledge over other human knowledge: it is of a different order, beginning from complete knowledge in his intellect and passing into the lower faculties of the soul. If Christ had new sensations and truly experiential knowledge, he did not thereby acquire new knowledge since he already had the knowledge to which these sensations were related.

If a habit is generated by experiential knowledge, Christ was given this habit when his soul was created; if it involves imperfection, however, Christ need not have been given it from the beginning. Christ knows the Mirror of the Word and individual things by the one likeness or medium of this Mirror; in this, his knowledge is similar to God's simultaneous rather than successive knowledge of all things, except that God knows them through being their cause. Since Christ loved all things by a natural love (and not necessarily by charity), he had to know all things in order to love them.

Although Christ had omniscience, he did not have omnipotence since, unlike knowledge, omnipotence was not necessary for his beatitude. Moreover, his soul as created could not have being and power from itself, which is essential to omnipotence.

Although Christ's human knowledge surpassed even that of the blessed in heaven and was clearest among all human knowledges, it was less clear than his

<sup>20</sup> This whole discussion has affinities and even textual similarities with the shorter discussion by William of Auxerre; see Forster, *Beatific Knowledge* (above, n. 1), p. 29, and Murray, *Infused Knowledge* (above, n. 1), pp. 32-33.

uncreated knowledge. That such a comparison of the two kinds of knowledge is even possible is shown by the master through an appeal to the doctrine of analogy or proportionality: like divine and human justice, Christ's uncreated and created knowledge share proportionately in a common effect, that is, knowledge of all things.

*Question 4 (no. 444): On Christ's human knowledge (Anonymous)*

This question ranges through a number of topics, asking why human knowledge was necessary in Christ, whether Christ by his 'ratiocinative' knowledge knew everything in act or actually, whether by reasoning he could acquire new knowledge, whether experiential knowledge was superfluous in him, and whether created knowledge in general was superfluous in him; finally, whether his created knowledge was equal to his uncreated knowledge.

(a) *Did Christ have only one knowledge?*

In response to a statement that Christ had both a created and an uncreated knowledge, an opposed argument reasons from the union of soul and body in ordinary human beings. In them this union results in only one knowledge. Therefore the union of Christ's soul and divinity should likewise result in only one knowledge (1).

To show that Christ needed human knowledge, the master appeals to Christ's saving work. In order to save humankind, Christ had to be like us in everything except sin. But to have an integral human nature, he had to assume an intellect. Therefore, in addition to his uncreated knowledge, he assumed created knowledge as well (2).

Replying to an implicit objection that it would have been enough for Christ to assume an intellect alone (without acts of knowledge), the master says that Christ's faculty or power of knowing was completed by every possible act, so that by his created knowledge Christ knew all things actually. This actual knowledge of all things, however, applies to only one aspect of Christ's created knowledge. This knowledge in him as man was twofold, one according to a higher way concerned with eternal truths, the other according to a lower way concerned with lower truths. Knowledge by this 'lower way' is 'rational' or 'ratiocinative', whereas the former knowledge is 'intellective'; it is by this intellective way of knowing that Christ's soul knew all things actually (2).

(b) *Whether Christ knew everything actually by his ratiocinative knowledge*

The last remark about Christ's actual knowledge raises the question whether he did not also know all things actually by the inferior way of ratiocination (3).<sup>21</sup> As

<sup>21</sup> Around the turn of the century Peter of Capua first raised this issue; see Murray, *ibid.*, p. 29.



the arguments and reply show, the sense of the question is whether Christ grew in knowledge by this kind of knowing. A series of authoritative texts are quoted to deny such actual and complete knowledge (and so to argue for the possibility of growth in Christ's human knowledge). The *Gloss* says that Christ learned while on earth; hence he did not know everything actually (3). Damascene says that Christ assumed an ignorant and servile nature (4), while the *Gloss on Luke* affirms that wisdom and grace advanced in his rational soul as did his physical growth with age (5); the *Gloss* also speaks of Christ's being fulfilled by a knowledge that is not divine (6). Bernard and Anselm are also quoted as maintaining that Christ learned by experiential knowledge (7-8).

To these authoritative texts is added a psychological argument. Like others, Christ had senses, imagination, and intellect, and when he sensed new objects, his senses were changed. This change in the senses was followed by an impression and change in the imagination and then in the intellect. From these diverse changes, receptions and impressions there came diverse new knowledge. Therefore, the argument continues, Christ learned new things and increased in knowledge over time insofar as he was man, even while he knew all things actually insofar as his soul was united to the divinity (9).

Against all these arguments a series of counterarguments maintain that Christ did know all things actually even according to the lower way of reasoning. A text from the *Gloss on the Psalms* is interpreted as saying that God put into Christ whatever he could have. This would have included the knowledge of everything he could have according to the lower way of reasoning (10), so that there would be no new knowledge in this way. Jerome and Bede (under the name of Gregory) are also quoted as holding that Christ had perfect human knowledge from the very moment of his conception (11-12).

But against these arguments there is adduced a text of Matthew saying that the devil showed Christ all the kingdoms of this world (13), a text implying, according to its proponent, that Christ learned something new while on earth when he was shown something.

In the main response the master develops his earlier remarks about the two types of human knowledge in Christ. Just as any medium has two faces that look to the extremes it mediates, so the soul of Christ had two faces, one looking to the Word to which it was united, the other looking to the flesh. According to this second face, the soul of Christ, insofar as it was united to the flesh, was conformed to the flesh (*conformis ... carni*: 15); according to the first face, the soul of Christ, as united to the Word, was 'deiform' (*deiformis*), or conformed to God. This term is not explained; it is likely the opposite of *conformis ... carni*.<sup>22</sup> As united to the

<sup>22</sup> We have emended the reading of the manuscript, which has *deformis*. If that reading is correct, the term might mean a lack of forms or concepts of individual things in Christ's soul. This could fit

Word, the master continues, the soul of Christ had knowledge of all creatures and knowledge and love of the whole Trinity. As the sun shows itself first and then shows all other things in itself, so the Word is the source of the knowledge first received by the soul of Christ as man and also that by which Christ's soul then knew all other things. Thus it was by this superior face of union with the Word that the soul of Christ knew all things by the Word (14).

As united and so conformed to the flesh, the master continues, Christ's soul used vision and other senses as instruments in order to know particular things insofar as these were subject to his senses. Thus the soul of Christ was assimilated to the flesh according to this lower way, just as it was assimilated to the divinity according to the superior way or face. If, as Bede says, angels could know things without a body, much more could the soul of Christ as united to the flesh know things through sense powers (15).

Having clarified this view of Christ's 'lower' way of knowing, the master comes to the point at issue. Christ's imagination and intellect would indeed be changed as a result of his sense knowledge, he admits, but this would be true only if Christ wished such a change; otherwise they would not be changed. Even when Christ did will that such knowledge should change his soul, he was not more knowing (*plus sciens*) than before nor did he know more or in a better way ('neque magis aut melius sciebat') than before. For Christ it would be rather like our being told something we already know: since Christ already knew everything in the Word, his knowledge did not increase in certitude. Whatever increase or advance took place happened in the new mode in which he knew things, always on the supposition that Christ willed his soul to be modified in this way (16). In short, the master maintains that Christ lacked actual knowledge of all things by this lower type of knowledge and yet, when he chose to use it, he did not learn anything new; he simply learned in a new way what he already knew with certitude.

The master next suggests an alternative position that would eliminate even this modal change in Christ's knowledge originating in the senses. Suppose, he says, that we are continually and unceasingly imagining something that is absent and that the imagined thing becomes present to our senses. In this case, we could not receive a new imagination of the thing other than the one we already possessed. This may have been the case with Christ universally, he suggests. That is, perhaps Christ received *every mode* of knowledge from the Word before his senses actually sensed something. He would then have from the Word an actual (that is, continuous and unceasing) imagination of all things. Were that the case, no new imagination could arise in him from his sensing things. Having an actual imagi-

with what follows. The knowledge of all things by the Word (14) would seem to imply a lack of individual forms in Christ's mind.

It seems more likely, however, that the author is contrasting two kinds of conformity; hence our emendation.

nation of all things in his soul already, the change of his senses in sensation would produce nothing new in his imagination (17). The implication of all this is that Christ would not increase even in the mode of knowing of his imagination or intellect.

The master, however, seems to doubt the force of this alternative suggestion, and we shall see from his reply to one of the arguments that he reverts to his first position. At this point he continues the discussion as follows. Someone might say that the suggestion cannot be true about the imagination or about phantasms related to reason. But even if that is so, he goes on, the former position would still hold: the intellect cannot be changed in act or actually by reason of something by which it has already been changed, that is, if the intellect is already formed by knowledge according to the higher way, it cannot be changed anew with respect to the same truth by knowledge according to the lower way (17).

Next comes a summary of the opinion of others on this question. Some, he indicates, say that Jesus did advance in wisdom and did learn because his condition was according to the mode of someone advancing or learning (18); others say that Christ advanced in knowledge not in himself or in knowledge itself, but in relation to others, and this by manifesting his wisdom to others in a progressive way (Damascene is quoted in support of this opinion: 19); still others say he advanced in wisdom because he reckoned the wisdom of others as his own (20).

The master now turns to the opening arguments. Damascene's saying that Christ assumed an ignorant and servile nature (4) cannot be used to prove that Christ advanced in human knowledge; the text refers to the ignorance found in that universal human nature, one individual of which Christ assumed (21). It was not therefore an ignorance in Christ's own human nature. This is confirmed, he adds, by Damascene's text saying that the identity of the (divine) person in Christ meant that his soul was endowed with knowledge of future things, a knowledge, our author adds, that was given according to the first face, which related Christ's soul to the deity (21). Against the argument that Christ received changes and a new species in his intellect (9) he repeats the main reply: Christ was changed if he wished, but he did not thereby pass from knowledge to (new) knowledge. Rather, he passed from lack of experience to experience, or he had a new mode of knowing (22). This is the first time the author mentions experiential knowledge. His reply, like the next one to be seen, shows that he has left aside the alternative suggestion that had been made; he relies henceforth on his main response.

One of the early arguments had taken a position akin to that alternative suggestion, holding that Christ received knowledge of everything he could know, even according to the lower way or lower part of reason (10). The master replies that Christ was given whatever the Father could give him with respect to fruition or beatitude and also with respect to the superior part of reason (according to the union of his soul to the Word). But he was not given everything according to the

union of his soul to the flesh, that is, according to the lower way (23). Thus the master leaves the way open for an advance of Christ in his human knowledge, an advance that is not absolute, as some held, but by a new mode of knowing that he also speaks of as experiential knowledge.

(c) *Could Christ advance from the unknown to the known by reasoning?*

This question concentrates on whether Christ could use the process of reasoning and, by means of it, acquire new knowledge.<sup>23</sup> An opening statement of the question begins from the master's previous position that Christ received external changes (in his senses) and thereby acquired knowledge in a new way (16; 22). If this were the case, it is argued, he should be able to use reasoning to proceed from the unknown to the known since he had a reasoning power, the power of cogitation, and other powers, at least according to the lower way of knowing (24). Against this, Damascene is quoted as saying that we do not 'look for' counsel in Christ (23).<sup>24</sup> Counsel, of course, would require a process of search on the way of arriving at new unknown conclusions.

The master replies that Christ did indeed receive external sense impressions or changes, but that he did not reason from them since reasoning arises from a need. To show that Christ had no such need, he first gives Augustine's analysis of how ordinary humans learn something (that is, in the language of this question, how they advance from the unknown to the known). In their case, Augustine says, they know partially and are partially ignorant; they seek by reasoning to know fully that part of the truth they do not know. In Christ, however, the master continues, full and not only partial knowledge was present. Christ could grow from infancy according to his flesh but not in his knowledge, for it was full and perfect; this was true even of his knowledge according to the lower way as to both kind and mode. Hence Christ needed no discussion or reasoning for fuller knowledge even in the mode of knowledge according to the lower way: it was so complete that he could not be in error in this mode of knowing (26).

But, it is argued, did not Christ know the principles of art and science, and did he not derive this knowledge from all his sense experiences formed into one experience and one understanding (*intellectus*), which is the principle of art and science? It would seem that he arrived at this (supposedly new) knowledge by inference (*collatio*) and so achieved new knowledge by reasoning (27).

It is clear from what has been said, the master replies, that although Christ had a variety of experiences, he lacked a variety of knowledge since he had the highest

<sup>23</sup> See n. 21 above.

<sup>24</sup> The original Greek and Burgundio's translation have 'speak of' instead of 'look for', and our text may have intended *inquimus* instead of *requirimus*.

possible knowledge from above. Our author adds somewhat cryptically that Christ could take up or make use of (*sumere*) a principle of art and science in another but not in himself (28): this seems to mean that Christ, when teaching, might make use of principles and reasoning for the sake of leading others to new truth even if he did not need them for himself.

The master then clarifies the problem about whether counsel existed in Christ. There is, he says, a twofold election or choice: either the movement or motion of choosing, or the choice at the conclusion of the motion. In Christ there was only the second kind of choice, so that counsel in him was not the counsel of one seeking (*consulens*) but of one who has completed the counselling (*consultus*). The same is true for judgment in Christ, he continues: judgment for Christ was not the motion of judgment, but judgment as found in the terminus or conclusion of the movement. Hence, the master says more generally, even if there were changes in Christ by the instrumentality of the senses, and even if Christ had phantasms and imaginations resulting from sensation, they did not have the nature of motion or the modality of motion; they were in him in their terminal state. Hence in Christ there was no reasoning motion or process (29). Reasoning, the motion or movement of inquisition seeking new and unknown truths, is thus excluded by the master from Christ because, in his view, Christ already possessed in a perfect state anything that could be accomplished by such a step-by-step process of learning.

(d) *Was experiential knowledge superfluous in Christ?*

A new question begins with the following argument: Christ's intellect, when operating according to the higher way of knowledge, knew particulars as well as universals and lower as well as higher things; hence it seems that experiential knowledge would be superfluous in him (30).

The master gives two quick replies: Christ, by his experiential knowledge, showed that he is like us (here again the master relates the theology of Christ's human attributes to his saving work). Further, the addition of experiential knowledge to the higher knowledge already possessed by Christ caused a delight or pleasure (*iucunditas*) in him because of the particular things he experienced. This is illustrated by the vision of God, in which the supreme delight is to see God and yet there are many particular delights in seeing the saints. These delights are less than those experienced by seeing God, but they do add to the total delight and so are not superfluous (31).

(e) *Did Christ have only uncreated or divine knowledge?*

An Augustinian doctrine about God is applied to Christ's knowledge to indicate that because 'whatever he understood or knew is God', his knowledge must have been only divine or uncreated (32). The master replies by first explaining a

common dictum and then illustrating it through an example that fits the question at hand.

It is said, he states, that in heaven the power of sensation will be turned (*convertetur*) into imagination, imagination into reason, and reason into intellect. This does not mean that in fact each or any of these powers becomes the other; it does mean that the senses will have greater delights than formerly because of these powers (that is, because of what these higher powers confer on sensation). His illustration is as follows: if I rejoice in how handsome some particular person is, my delight in that person would be increased if he were my brother. In the same way, because of what is added to sensation in heaven, the senses will delight more than they now do; the same will be true of the imagination and other powers. Hence when the divinity made its influence felt even in Christ's senses, it can be held that 'whatever he understood or knew is God'. This is said not because of his uncreated or divine knowledge but because the influence or overflow of divinity (to all his knowing powers) extends as far as the senses (33).

(f) *Was Christ's created knowledge equal to his uncreated knowledge?*

The first two opening arguments seek to show that Christ's created knowledge is unequal to his uncreated or divine knowledge. The uncreated knowledge, says the first argument, is a substance, the created knowledge an accident; hence they are disproportionate. Since the greater (the uncreated knowledge) is a knowing of all things, the created (being disproportionate to the uncreated) is not a knowing of all things (and so is unequal to the uncreated knowledge).

The second argument maintains that, since in every actual knowledge there is a knower, the knowable, and the knowledge itself, these three will be found in the soul of Christ as well as in God as knower. Since Christ knows as God, these three elements will be nobler in him as God than in his human soul (when he knows by it). Even what is known (*scitum*), insofar as it is known by (Christ as) God, is nobler than what is known by the soul of Christ. His created knowledge is therefore disproportionate to his divine knowledge and so is unequal to it. It makes no sense, then, to speak of Christ's soul having a knowledge like that of his divinity (35).

An argument in opposition to these first two arguments maintains that Christ's created knowledge *is* proportionate to his knowledge as God. There is nothing known by a person, it says, that is not known by his soul. Likewise, there is nothing known by Christ that is not known by his soul. Hence Christ's knowledge (as God) and his soul's (human) knowledge are equal both in loftiness (*in summo*) and in intensity; thus, contrary to what has been said, they are proportionate.

The master's reply is a compromise between these two positions. If we consider the number of things known, he says, these two knowledges are equal, but only in that way and in no other. He illustrates his position with the example of two equally

long measuring rods: even if one is thicker than the other, or one is wood and the other iron, they remain equal in their ability to measure but are not equal as things. Similarly, the knowledge in Christ's soul and his divine knowledge are equal as to the number of things known but in no other way (38). With this statement the question ends.

### *Summary*

The master's teaching on Christ's human knowledge may be summarized as follows. The basic reason why Christ had human knowledge in addition to his divine knowledge is its role in Christ's saving work: Christ had to be like humans to save them, and this likeness included not only an intellect but the perfecting of this intellect by actual knowledge of all things, at least in that face of his soul that looks to the Word, to which it was united and by which it knew all things. Hence there could be no true growth or increase in Christ's human knowledge either as to things known or as to certitude. However, Christ could, if he wished, exercise a lower way of knowing according to the other face of his soul, which looks to the flesh to which it is united: he could allow his imagination and intellect to be changed by sense knowledge and thereby he would know what he already knew, but now in a new, experiential mode. Only in this latter sense can one understand a growth in Christ's human knowledge.

Because Christ's human knowledge was so complete and perfect, he neither needed nor could have discussion or reasoning whereby he might reach fuller knowledge; this was true even of his use of the lower way of knowing. He had no need to go through a process of self-counseling or choosing or judging: his already complete knowledge precluded such search or process of seeking and choosing since he already possessed the end result aimed at by ordinary human persons. Yet his experiential knowledge was not superfluous, for it shows his likeness to us (important for his saving us) and it gave him new delight and pleasure in the particular things he experienced. This delight came about because his sense powers felt the influence of the divinity extending itself through his intellect and imagination as far as the senses so as to produce greater delight in them. Although Christ's human knowledge was so perfect, it was equal to his divine knowledge only regarding the number of things known but not in any other way since it was disproportionate to the infinite divine knowledge in all other ways.

### *Conclusion*

These summaries and analyses show the authors of our questions deeply engaged in the various discussions about Christ's knowledge that were current at their time. The first question is too brief and summary to contribute much to these discussions, but there are interesting and original contributions from the other two

authors. The most important of these is their analyses, more detailed than usual, of the human psychology of knowing, and their application of these analyses to the special case of Christ's human psychology and knowledge. The author of the second and third questions goes into considerable detail concerning the relations of the intellectual and sense knowing powers of Christ; the author of the fourth question has interesting new analyses of the reasoning and counselling processes in general and in relation to Christ. Both authors present personal insights in their developments concerning Christ's experiential knowledge. The author of questions 2 and 3 reveals, while rejecting it, an opinion about Christ's fivefold knowledge that circulated at his time; his reply, insisting on only one created knowledge in Christ, seems original and is interesting. He and the author of question 4 contribute new views on the comparison between Christ's created and uncreated knowledge.

From their texts and, we hope, from our study, it can be seen that these authors made a significant contribution to the gradually developing body of doctrine concerning Christ's human knowledge and its relation to his divine knowledge and his human experiences.

### III. EDITION OF THE TEXTS

In the edition of the texts emendations have been kept to the minimum required to correct obvious errors or to clarify the text; these emendations have been indicated in the text itself or in the notes.

Since these texts are interesting mainly to students of theology and philosophy and since they offer little of palaeographical interest, the medieval spelling has been normalized according to classical usage, e.g., *ae* for *e*, *tio* for *cio*, *v* for *u*. Unusual spellings, however, have been noted. 'ms.' refers to the hand of the original scribe.

In the references the following abbreviations will be used:

apud Lyranum = *Biblia sacra cum glossa ordinaria et glossa interlineari ... et postilla Nicolai Lyrani*, 7 voll. (1, 3, 6: Paris, 1590; 2: Venice, 1603; 4, 5: Lyons, 1545; 7: Lyons, 1590).

*De fide orth.* = Joannes Damascenus, *De fide orthodoxa*, PG (= textus graecus); Burg. (= versio latina Burgundionis, ed. E. M. Buytaert, *St. John Damascene: De Fide Orthodoxa: Versions of Burgundio and Cerbanus* [St. Bonaventure, N. Y.-Louvain, 1955]).

*Glossa Lombardi* = Petrus Lombardus, *Commentarius in psalmos davidicos*, in PL 191.55A-1295B, et *Collectanea in omnes d. Pauli Apostoli epistolas*, in PL 191.1297A-1696C et PL 192.10B-520A.

*Glossa ord.* = *Glossa ordinaria*, in PL 113.67B-1315C et 114.9A-752B, et apud Lyranum (q.v.).



<Quaestio 1>

*De scientia Christi creata*

- 1 <I, 62vb> *Jesus proficiebat sapientia* etc., *Glossa*: 'Sicut corporis est proficere aetate, ita animae rationalis sapientia et gratia.' Ergo proficiebat sapientia etc.
- 5 2 Contra: Plenitudo non potest augeri et veritas variari, et Christus erat *plenus gratiae* etc.
- 3 Respondeo: *Glossa* dicit conditionem humanae naturae.
- 4 Item, de aequivocatione copulationis respondeo: Bene permittitur in Sacra Scriptura, unde 'Deus et homo.'
- 10 5 Item, secundum quod homo scit omnia quae Pater. Ergo est aequae sciens.
- 6 Contra: *Confortata est scientia eius et non potero ad eam*, *Glossa*: 'Christus secundum quod homo non potest aequari Deo, nec etiam in scientia.'
- 7 Respondeo: Non in limpидitate sciendi, sed in numero scitorum potest.
- 8 Contra: Scit quidquid scit Pater in numero scitorum, et scit praeterea
- 15 limpидitatem illam. Ergo omnino ei aequatur.
- 9 Respondeo: Non valet, quia non scit illa limpидitate.
- 10 Item, dignior est scientia speculativa scientia practica. Sed scit quidquid scit Pater scientia speculativa. Ergo scit quidquid scit Pater scientia practica. Ergo scit creare et iustificare.
- 20 11 Praeterea: Est aequae sciens; quare non aequae potens?
- 12 Respondeo: Non facit ad beatitudinem <potentia>, sed scientia.
- 13 Item, Christus accepit defectus corporis ut redimeret corpus; eadem ratione, defectus animae ut redimeret animam.

5 veritas: aeternitas MS.      6 gratiae: gratia MS.

2 Jesus ... sapientia: Lc 2:52.

2-3 Sicut ... gratia: cf. *Glossam ord.* in Lc 2:52 (apud Lyrarum 5.132va, cf. PL 114.252A): 'Sicut est carnis aetate proficere, sic est animae rationalis sapientia et gratia proficere. ...' Cf. Bedam, *In Lucae evangelium expositio* 1.2.52, in Lc 2:52 (CCL 120.74, PL 92.350D): 'Nam sicut carnis est aetate sic est animae sapientia proficere et gratia.'

6 plenus gratiae etc.: cf. Jo 1:14 (*plenum gratiae et veritatis*).

7 conditionem ... naturae: cf. *Glossam interlin.* in Ps 138:6 (apud Lyrarum 3.1509): 'Veritas humanae conditionis ostenditur.' Ex Cassiodoro, *Expositio Psalmorum*, in Ps 138:6 (CCL 98.1244, PL 70.985D): 'Et ut conditionis humanae veritas panderetur, adiecerit *nec potero ad eam*, quia natura hominis quam est dignatus assumere, diuinae substantiae se non poterat adaequare.'

11 Confortata ... eam: cf. Ps 138:6: *Mirabilis facta est scientia tua ex me; confortata est, non potero ad eam*.

11-12 Christus ... scientia: cf. *Glossam Lombardi* in Ps 138:15 (PL 191.1218B): 'Et tamen non potero ad eam, [Hilar., Cassiod.] ex eo quod homo, veritas humanae conditionis ostenditur, cum ait, non potero ad eam, quia homo assumptus divinae substantiae non potest aequari in scientia vel in alio.' Cf. Hilarium, *Tractatus super psalmos*, in Ps 138:17 (CSEL 22.757, PL 9.801C-D), et Cassiodorum, *Exp. Psalm.*, in Ps 138:6 (CCL 98.1244, PL 70.985D): cf. supra, n. ad lin. 7.

14 Respondeo: Non oportuit, quia miser esset.

25 15 Item, omnem perfectionem habuit ab initio. Ergo nihil accrevit ei ex glorificatione corporis.

16 Item, perfectam et omnium scientiam habuit ex deitate. Quid opus fuit addi scientiam creatam? Si dicit quod anima non fuit perceptibilis scientiae increatae, contra: *Divinitas habitavit* in anima Christi *corporaliter*, id est, per essentiam, per inhabitantem gratiam, et per unionem. Sed in quocumque habitat per gratiam, illuminat per scientiam. Ergo, etiam circumscripta alia scientia, deitas illuminabit animam Christi scientia increata.

17 Respondeo: Sine scientia non haberet fruitionem.

18 Item, quidquid dicitur de utralibet natura simpliciter dicitur. Sed scientia 35 creata dicitur de humana natura; ergo simpliciter. Sed illa scientia minor est scientia increata quia in nullo adaequari potest. Ergo simpliciter Christus minori scientia scit quam ante. Ergo minus scit quam ante.

19 Contra: Eandem habet scientiam quam ante et praeterea creatam. Ergo non minus scit.

40 20 Praeterea, habendo unam marcam et aliam eiusdem ponderis et pretii ditior est quam ante. Ergo habendo unam scientiam et aliam eorundem scitorum scientior est quam ante.

21 Respondeo: Ditior est quis ex multiplicatione habitorum, sed non est scientior ex multitudine scitorum, sed ex modo sciendi.

45 22 Item, Christus est minor seipso; eadem ratione minus sciens seipso; similiter minus bonus seipso; ergo minus diligendus quam ante. Per totum <minus> habeatur quam ante.

23 Contra: Ex pluribus causis diligendus est modo quam ante quia ex eo quod est Creator et Recreator. Ergo non minus, sed potius magis.

50 24 Respondeo: Non valet 'ergo minus diligendus quam ante': causa enim dilectionis ex multis bonitatibus conflatur.

## <Quaestio 2>

### <De scientia Christi>

#### (a) <Utrum novus habitus scientiae acquisitus fuerit in Christo>

1 <II, 144vb> <Q>uaeritur de scientia Christi, utrum novus habitus acquisitus fuerit in Christo, et videtur, Lc secundo: *Jesus proficiebat aetate et 5 sapientia*. Ergo Jesus profecit scientia.

29 Divinitas ... corporaliter: cf. Col 2:9: ... *in ipso [Christus] inhabitat omnis plenitudo divinitatis corporaliter*.

4-5 Jesus ... sapientia: Lc 2:52.

2 Respondebat quod in se non profecit scientia, sed in opinione hominum vel eorundem aedificatione.

3 Sed contra: Proficiebat in se et vere aetate; ergo similiter sapientia vel scientia.

10 4 Praeterea, super illud *Jesus* <145ra> *proficiebat* etc., glossa Bedae: 'Sicut carnis est aetate proficere, sic animae rationalis sapientia et gratia proficere, non quod hoc egerit susceptor Deus cum supra plenus fuisse sapientia describitur, sed quia hoc pro redemptione salutis nostrae elegit suscipere, ut cum caro et anima rationalis a Deo suscipitur, a Deo utraque pariter salvarentur.' Ex hac glossa aperte  
15 videtur posse argui quod si profecit aetate in se, quod similiter et sapientia.

5 Item, duplex est scientia, una secundum fluxum causae ad effectum, et haec est scientia 'propter quid'; alia est secundum viam contrariam, scilicet effectus ad causam, quae quidem est scientia 'quia', et videtur quod talis scientia in Christo acquisita fuerit quia Christus res videbat sicut alii homines. Ergo sicut ex inspectione rerum adgeneratur scientia in aliis hominibus, ita et in Christo, vel dicatur  
20 ratio quare non.

6 Item, in Ez dicitur: *Nobiscum didicit in terra*, Glossa: 'Est <dignatus interrogare homines in terra, qui per divinitatem suam semper angelos docet in caelo>.'

25 7 Item, dolorum et poenarum secundum sensus habuit experimentum. Ergo multa didicit experientia, ut sitire, esurire. Ergo, ut videtur, aliquis novus habitus accrevit in ipso.

8 Et idem potest obici de comprehensione formarum in sensu ut, immutato sensu ab idolo, transiret similitudo illa ad opinionem et ultra per depurationem ad

13 redemptione salutis nostrae *corr. ex salutis nostrae redemptione MS.* 22 *post est lacuna in MS.* 29 idolo: ydolo *hic et alibi MS.*

10-14 Sicut ... salvarentur: cf. *Glossam ord.* in Lc 2:52 (PL 114.252A, apud Lyranum 5.132va): 'Sicut carnis est aetate proficere, sic est animae rationalis sapientia et gratia proficere, non quod hoc eguerit susceptor Deus cum supra plenus fuisse sapientia describitur, sed quia hoc pro remedio salutis nostrae elegit suscipere, ut cum caro et anima rationalis a Deo suscipitur, a Deo utraque pariter salvaretur.' Cf. Bedam, *In Lucae evangelium expositio* 1.2, in Lc 2:52 (CCL 120.74, PL 92.350D).

22 *Nobiscum ... terra*: textus citatus non est Ezechielis sed commentarii Gregorii in Ezechielem. Cf. textum Stephani Langton in Landgraf, *Wissen* (cit. supra, n. 1), p. 97 n. 5: 'Sed videtur, quod creverit scientia Christi. Dicit enim glossa in principio Ezechielis: Discens inter homines in terris et docet angelos in celo. ... Tamen in originali super Ezechielem non habetur hoc verbum discens, sed hoc verbum interrogat.' Cf. etiam Alexandrum Halensem, *Glossa in quatuor libros Sententiarum* 3.13.16 (E), edd. Patres Collegii S. Bonaventurae (Quaracchi, 1954) (3.133 n. a): 'Item, Glossa in principio Ezechielis: "Discit in terra, qui angelos docet in caelo". Editores citant Gregorium, *In Hiezechielem prophetam* 1, hom. 2, num. 3 (CCL 142.18, PL 76.796B-C), ubi legitur: "Vt enim non auderent homines in infirma aetate praedicare, ille anno duodecimo aetatis suae interrogare homines est dignatus in terra, qui per diuinitatem suam semper angelos docet in caelo."

Post 'est' lacuna invenitur in textu. Textum coniecturalem supplevimus secundum commentarium Gregorii, quod in mente videtur habuisse auctor ut glossa textus suppositi scripturae sacrae.

30 intellectum, et ita novus aliquis habitus in ipso acquireretur ex inspectione rerum extra.

9 Hoc etiam apparet per hoc quod modo videbat aliquem hominem, Petrum vel alium, quem prius non viderat.

10 Si concedatur, contra secundum Augustinum: Anima Christi unita erat  
35 speculo aeternitatis in quo sive in suo exemplari erant sensibilia et intelligibilia. Ergo qua ratione anima Christi vel Christus accipiebat in illo speculo intelligibilia, eadem et sensibilia. Ergo habebat cognitionem sensibilibum sicut et intelligibilium. Ergo nulla scientia accrevit ei.

11 Item, Augustinus: 'Anima illa sicut ferrum in igne ita posita est in Deo ut  
40 quidquid sentit, cognoscit, intelligit, Deus est.' Ergo ex inspectione rerum non potuit in ipso adgenerari scientia sensitiva.

(b) <Utrum in Christo scientia rei in Verbo fuerit eadem cum  
scientia rei in se>

12 Iuxta hoc quaerebatur sic: Anima Christi, conversa ad speculum cui unita  
45 erat, in illo videbat omnia. Similiter, eadem conversa supra se, in se videbat et sciebat omnia. Aut haec scientia est eadem cum illa aut non, et videtur quod non quia alia est cognitio angeli secundum quam res videt in Verbo et alia secundum quam res videt in se quia illa matutina, haec vespertina. Ergo similiter ex hac parte.

34-35 Anima ... intelligibilia: non refert auctor ad doctrinam christologicam Augustini, qui non loquitur tam explicitè de scientia beata Christi, sed ad suam doctrinam de scientia beatorum in caelo. Vide infra, q. 3, n. ad linn. 78-81.

De doctrina Augustini ad scientiam Christi pertinente vide A. M. Dubarle, 'La science humaine du Christ selon saint Augustin', *Revue des sciences philosophique et théologique* 29 (1940) 244-63, sive idem, 'La connaissance humaine du Christ d'après saint Augustin', *Ephemerides theologiae lovanienses* 18 (1941) 5-25, T. J. van Bavel, *Recherches sur la christologie de saint Augustin* (Fribourg, 1954), pp. 146-75, F. Moriones, *Enchiridion theologicum sancti Augustini* (Madrid, 1961), pp. 314-18 (textus de scientia Christi), et Ernst, *Lehre* (cit. supra, n. 2), pp. 18-35.

Verbum *speculum aeternitatis* primo apparuit, ut videtur, in *Summa theologiae* Godefredi Pictavensis (inter 1212 et 1219) et deinde intravit in scholas. Vide J.-P. Torrell, *Théorie de la prophétie et philosophie de la connaissance aux environs de 1230: la contribution d'Hugues de Saint-Cher* (Louvain, 1977), pp. 188-207, praesertim n. 1 (pp. 188-89). Textus Godefredi datur a Landgraf, *Wissen* (cit. supra, n. 1), p. 103. Vide etiam Philippum Cancellarium, *Summa de bono: De bono gratie in homine* 1.7, ed. N. Wicki, 2 voll. (Berne, 1985), 2.511-14.

39-40 Anima ... est: non est detectum. Cf. Joannem Scotum Eriugenam, *De divina praedestinatione* 2.1 (CCLM 50.12, PL 122.360c): 'Age iam; si omne quod in deo est deus est, voluntas autem dei in deo est, deus est igitur dei voluntas. Non enim aliud est ei esse et velle; sed quod est ei esse, hoc est et velle.' Cf. etiam *Summam Sententiarum* (PL 176.59A): 'Dicit enim Augustinus. Quidquid in Deo est, Deus est.'

Fontes augustiniani huius doctrinae dantur ab editore Joannis Scoti, G. Madec, ibid. (CCLM 50.12, n. ad linn. 17-18), qui dependet ab U. Horst, *Die Trinitäts- und Gotteslehre des Robert von Melun* (Mainz, 1964), p. 149 n. 19. Attamen, ut in Joanne Scoto et in *Summa Sententiarum*, textus non advertunt ad animam Christi.

13 Praeterea, nulla scientia limpidior est se ipsa. Sed scientia animae Christi  
50 secundum quam res videt in Verbo multum limpidior est illa scientia secundum  
quam res videt in se. Ergo haec non est illa.

14 Item, Christus scientiam unam habuit secundum gratiam unionis, aliam  
habuit consimilem scientiae animae glorificatae quae omnia videt in Verbo, et hanc  
habuit in quantum comprehensam et haec non fuit illa. Ergo cum utraque sit creata,  
55 plures creatas scientias habuit.

15 Item, videtur quod quinque scientias habuit Christus, unam increatam et  
quattuor creatas quia, sicut iam tactum est, una fuit in Christo scientia secundum  
gratiam unionis, alia fuit in ipso ut fuit comprehensor, consimilia scientiae  
animarum glorificatarum; duae aliae fuerunt in ipso secundum quod videt res in  
60 proprio genere, una intellectiva, altera sensitiva.

16 Solutio: Ad primum [1, 3, 4], Jesus dicitur proficere scientia, sicut vult  
*Glossa*, secundum manifestationem suae scientiae: dicit enim glossa super illud:  
*Jesus proficiebat*: 'Iuxta hominis naturam proficiebat sapientia, non quod ipse  
sapientior est tempore qui a prima conceptionis hora spiritu sapientiae plenus  
65 permanebat, sed eandem qua plenus erat sapientiam ceteris ex tempore paulatim  
demonstrabat', et hoc in fine glossae aperte innuitur.

17 Ad idem facit quod dicit Damascenus: 'Crescebat aetate, scientia, sapientia,  
et secundum aetatis augmentationem inhaerentem animae suae sapientiam manifes-  
tabat.' Sensus est, etsi non verba. Unde in praedicta glossa dicitur in fine: 'Quantum  
70 proficiebat aetate, patefaciebat hominibus dona gratiae quae sibi inerant.' Et ideo  
dicit alia glossa quod 'sicut carnis aetate proficiebat, sic animae rationalis sapientia  
et gratia proficiebat', ut illud sic referas ad manifestationem, quia quanto plus aetate  
crescebat, tanto plus de sua scientia manifestabat hominibus.

18 Ad aliud [7] dicendum quod revera in ipso fuit scientia experimenti  
75 sensuum quantum ad sitim, esuriem et talia, et quae sit ista scientia plenius dicetur  
postea, et quod hanc scientiam experimenti adquisierit habetur per illud ad Heb

64 qui a: quia ms.

63-66 Iuxta ... demonstrabat: sub nomine Gregorii in *Glossa ord.* in Lc 2:52 (apud Lyrarum  
5.133a) et infra, q. 4, num. 12, sed est Bedae, *In evangelium* 1, hom. 19 (in CCL), hom. 12 (in  
PL) (CCL 122.139, PL 94.67c). Textus *Glossae* citatur a Lombardo, 3 *Sent.* 13.1.5, 3a ed., edd.  
PP. Collegii S. Bonaventurae, vol. 2 (Grottaferrata, 1981), p. 85.

66 in fine ... innuitur: cf. Bedam, loc. cit.: '*apud Deum et homines*: quia quantum proficiente  
aetate patefaciebat hominibus dona gratiae quae sibi inerant et sapientiae, tantum eos ad laudem Dei  
excitabat. ...' In Lombardo, loc. cit.

67-69 Crescebat ... manifestabat: cf. Damascenum, *De fide orth.* 3.22 (PG 94.1085c et 1088a);  
Burg., c. 66.1 (p. 263): 'Proficere autem dicitur "sapientia et aetate et gratia": aetate quidem augens;  
per augmentationem autem aetatis eam quae inerat ei sapientiam in manifestationem ducens. ...'

69-70 Quantum ... inerant: cf. Bedam, cit. supra, n. ad lin. 66.

71-72 sicut ... proficiebat: cf. Bedam, cit. supra, num. 4.

75-76 plenius dicetur postea: vide infra, num. 25, et q. 3, numm. 1-16.

quarto: *Non habemus pontificem qui non possit compati infirmitatibus*, *Glossa*: 'Didicit ex eis quae passus est.' Quod autem nulla scientia denuo in Christo accreverit probatur per illud Jer 31: *Femina circumdabit virum*, *Glossa*: 'Gremio  
80 uteri sui virum ab ipso conceptu perfectum quantum ad sapientiam, scientiam, sicut solitis mensibus demonstratur', et dicit Damascenus quod, quia anima Christi unita fuit Filio Dei secundum indivisibilitatem, ditata fuit futurorum cognitione et omnibus divinis signis.

19 Quod obicit utrum quantum ad comprehensionem formarum in sensu  
85 acquisitus fuit aliquis habitus interior sive aliqua scientia sensitiva [8], respondeo quod sensitiva scientia proprie sumitur et improprie. Apprehensio sensus exterioris improprie dicitur scientia sensitiva, et quia quotidie fiebant in sensibus exterioribus Christi huiusmodi apprehensiones, scientia sensitiva improprie sumpta acquirebatur in ipsa; scientia vero sensitiva proprie sumpta est secundum sensum commu-  
90 nem, in quo sensu communi sensus exteriores perficiuntur quantum ad cognitionem et iudicium: ideo 'communis' dicitur quia in ipso omnes perficiuntur, sicut plures lineae in eodem puncto terminantur, unde sensus communis est dicere quoniam album est dulce, quod non pertinet ad sensum exteriorem. Huiusmodi scientia sensitiva non fuit acquisita in Christo.

95 20 Si obiciat: 'Forma ita extra immutabat oculum Christi; immutatus oculus idolum deferebat ad sensum communem et ulterius per depurationem ad intellectum' [8], dicimus quod falsum est. Immo omnes potentiae interiores Christi completae erant in suis habitibus: quia enim unita fuit anima Christi Filio Dei, habuit intellectum completum, imaginationem completam, phantasiam completam,  
100 similiter et sensum communem. Sed sensus exterior incompletus fuit quantum ad immutationes quae poterant in ipso fieri, et quia incompletus erat ex illa parte, accrescebat aliquid Christo, scilicet aliqua nova apprehensio in sensu exteriori, nec, immutato visu exteriori in Christo, transibat idolum ad sensum communem sed stabat in sensu, sicut mirabiliter contingit quod in dormientibus qui de nocte  
105 surgunt dormiendo intelligentia influit supra imaginationem, imaginatio supra

81 solitis mensibus: solidis mentibus MS.  
phantasiam: fantasiam *hic et alibi* MS.

99 imaginationem: ymaginationem *hic et alibi* MS.

77 Non ... infirmitatibus: Heb 4:14.

78 Didicit ... est: cf. Heb 5:8: ... *didicit ex iis quae passus est*.

79 Femina ... virum: Jer 31:22.

79-81 Gremio ... demonstratur: cf. Hieronymum, *In Hieremiam* 6.22.7, in Jer 31:22 (CCL 74.313, PL 24.914D-915A): '... *femina circumdabit uirum* gremio uteri sui, qui iuxta incrementa quidem aetatis per uagitus et infantiam proficere uidebitur sapientia et aetate, sed perfectus uir in ventre femineo solitis mensibus continebitur.'

81-83 quia ... signis: cf. Damascenum, *De fide orth.* 3.21 (PG 94.1084B), Burg., c. 65 (p. 261): 'Propter hypostaseos autem (id est personae) identitatem, et indivisibilem unionem ditata est Domini anima futurorum cognitione, ut et reliquis divinis signis.'

phantasiam, phantasia supra sensum communem, et sic excitatur dormiens; surgit et ponit frenum in equo suo et tamen non utitur sensibus exterioribus. Unde illa influentia quae incipiebat ab intelligentia stat in sensu communi et non transit ad sensus exteriores. Sic in Christo similitudo rei immutans oculum eius non transit  
110 ulterius quia, sicut dicunt omnes, potentiae eius interiores completae sunt in suis habitibus.

21 Quod obicit: 'Modo videt Petrum quem prius non viderat' etc. [9], respondeo: Modo videt Petrum vel alium sub forma immutante oculum quem prius non viderat sub forma immutante, sed nihilominus viderat visu interiori et sciebat  
115 illum, sicut Eliseus absens vidit Giezi accipientem talenta duo a Naaman, quarto Regum, quinto in fine, ubi dicitur: *Nonne cor meum in praesenti erat quando reversus est homo de curru suo in occursum tui* etc.?

22 Ad aliud [14] dicendum quod tantum una scientia fuit in Christo, creata dico.

120 23 Quod autem obicit in ipso fuisse scientiam creatam secundum gratiam unionis etc. [15], dicendum quod non fuerunt diversae scientiae sed una scientia, et tamen diversa scita. Nam anima Christi gratia unionis sciebat mysteria incarnationis in quantum comprehensor, sicut animae glorificatae sciebant ea quae pertinebant ad beatitudinem creatam vel increatam; in quantum homo primitias  
125 nostrae massae accipiens sciebat ea quae pertinebant <145va> ad hominem, et eadem scientia creata haec diversa scita sciebat, et est eiusdem speciei scientia Christi creata et scientia animae glorificatae.

24 Si obiciat: 'Christi scientia creata in infinitum limpidior est quam alicuius animae glorificatae scientia, ergo non sunt eiusdem speciei', non sequitur. Instantia: Caritas maior in infinitum erit in patria quam in via, et tamen eadem caritas  
130 in via et in patria.

25 Scientiam autem experimenti quantum ad poenam habuit Christus. Sed diligenter circa hoc videndum est quod in scientia experimenti duo sunt: cognitio quae est in sensu communi et infectio quae est in sensu exteriori. Acquisita ergo  
135 fuit in Christo scientia experimenti quantum ad infectionem sensus, non quantum ad cognitionem.

106 excitatur dormiens; surgit: *fort. excitatus dormiens, surgit legendum est* 115 Eliseus: Helyseus MS. Giezi: Gyezi MS. 122 *post Christi add. unita Verbo Patris et del. MS.*  
123 sciebant: sciebat MS.

115-117 sicut ... etc.: videtur auctor habere in mente Augustinum, *De civitate Dei* 22.29 (CCL 48.858-59, PL 41.797-98), ubi ponit exemplum Elisei et Giezi in hoc contextu.

116-117 Nonne ... tui: 4 Reg 5:26.

## &lt;Quaestio 3&gt;

*De scientia Christi <experimentalī>*

1 <II, 74vb> <S>equitur determinare de scientia Christi experimentalī,  
circa quod quaeritur utrum omnia simul actu sciverit; secundo, de comparatione  
scientiae animae Christi ad scientiam increatam; tertio, de comparatione scientiae  
5 Christi ad omnipotentiam.

## (a) &lt;Utrum Christus omnia simul actu sciverit&gt;

2 De primo dicit beatus Bernardus ad Eugenium papam: 'Quod ab initio  
Christus scivit, temporali didicit experimento.' 'Discere' dicit actum transitionis ab  
innotitia ad notitiam, et Christus habuit hunc actum. Ergo venit in notitiam alicuius  
10 quod prius ignoravit. Ergo non scivit omnia ab instanti conceptionis.

3 Item, caecus non habet iudicium de coloribus ante sensum usum. Ergo nec  
Christus habuit iudicium de coloribus ante sensum sive usum sensus. Ergo eo  
adveniente acquisita est ei scientia.

4 Contra, Augustinus: 'Durum est dicere quod sancti oculis apertis non  
15 videant omnia, anima glorificata. Durius autem est dicere clausis oculis non videre  
omnia.' Ex hoc arguo: Sancti apertis oculis vident omnia et non minus clausis  
vident omnia. Ergo Christus, cum esset comprehensor, vidit omnia clausis oculis  
sicut apertis. Sed apertio oculorum non est nisi praesentia sensus, clausio sensus  
absentia. Ergo Christus ante sensum sicut post vidit omnia. Ergo non habuit  
20 scientiam experimentalem.

5 Item, Deus Pater dedit animae Christi ab initio creationis eius omne  
bonum cuius ipsa erat susceptibilis; ergo scientiam experimentalem: constat enim  
quod ipsa est quoddam bonum.

6 Solutio: Sicut diximus supra, ita immutabiliter dicimus quod anima Christi  
25 exaltata fuit supra naturam aliarum animarum, unde in Christo alius fuit ordo quam  
in nobis, quoniam nostra scientia incipit a sensu et sic deinde in imaginationem

2 De scientia Christi in manu moderna in marg. MS. 16 oculis: opulis MS. 26 imagi-  
nationem: ymaginationem MS.

7-8 Quod ... experimento: cf. Bernardum, *De gradibus humilitatis et superbiae* 3.12, in *Opera omnia* 3, edd. J. Leclercq et H.-M. Rochais (Rome, 1963), p. 25: 'Cum igitur videas Christum in una quidem persona duas habere naturas, unam qua semper fuit, alteram qua esse coepit, et secundum sempiternum quidem suum esse, semper omnia nosse, secundum temporale vero, multa temporaliter expertum fuisse. ...' (In PL 182.947D-948A.) Cf. ibid. 3.9-10 (Leclercq-Rochais, p. 23, PL 178.946B-947B).

14-16 Durum ... omnia<sup>1</sup>: cf. Augustinum, *De civitate Dei* 22.29.2 (CCL 48.858, PL 41.797): 'Durum est enim dicere, quod sancti talia corpora tunc habebunt, ut non possint oculos claudere atque aperire cum uolent; durius autem, quod ibi Deum, quisquis oculos clauserit, non uidebit.'

24 supra: vide q. 2, numm. 16-18.



etc., ut supra. E contra, scientia Christi inceptit ab intelligentia quam habuit completam ab initio creationis, ab intelligentia transivit in phantasiam quam habuit completam, ab illa in communem sensum quem habuit completum omnibus  
30 formis, ab illo transivit in particulares sensus et particulares formas quas omnes habuit completas ab initio in communi sensu, qui completus erat omnibus formis. Coniungebantur igitur communi sensui particulares sensus, sicut puncto multae lineae copulantur nec tamen aliquid accrescit puncto.

7 Ad primum [2] dicimus quod Christus transivit ab inexperientia ad  
35 experientiam, nec valet: 'Acquisita est ei scientia experimentalis, ergo scientia' [3], ut patet per praedicta [6].

8 Ad aliud [4] dicimus quod omnia vident in patria 'apertis et clausis oculis', non tamen dicimus 'apertis oculis', id est, sub sensu, quoniam ibi non est omnium sensus.

40 9 Ad id quod sequitur [5] dicimus quod habitum illum habuit semper, et hoc secundum eos qui dicunt habitum acquisitum per scientiam experimentalem. — Vel aliter dicimus quod habuit omne bonum indiminutum; bonum autem diminutum, sicut est bonum fidei, non habuit quoniam sonat in imperfectionem.

10 Item, Christus scivit omnia. Aut igitur scivit res convertendo se supra se  
45 aut convertendo se supra res, et quodcumque dicas, quaero utrum pluribus similitudinibus scivit res aut una. Videtur quod pluribus, quoniam similitudo asini non est similitudo hominis. <75ra> Si concedatur, contra: Anima Christi eisdem similitudinibus convertitur ad speculum et ad res. Sed constat quod non secundum diversas similitudines convertitur ad speculum; ergo non ad res. Sed ad speculum  
50 secundum unum et idem convertitur. Ergo secundum unum et idem ad res convertitur. Ergo non secundum plures similitudines.

11 Quod concedimus: unus enim fuit habitus in Christo quo scivit omnia. Dicimus tamen quod rationes rerum plures sunt, sed propter illas non multiplicatur ex parte Christi scientia, immo unica est qua comprehendit asinum et hominem  
55 etc. Deus etiam scit omnia simul actu una scientia, ita quod ipse est omnium causa. Anima autem <Christi> scit omnia simul actu una scientia, ita tamen quod non est omnium causa. — Et nota quod hic est ordo naturalis cognitionis: scitur unum per unum; sciuntur multa per multa. Haec sunt quasi duo extrema ex quibus collige medium, scilicet unum per multa et multa per unum. Primum est in Deo,  
60 secundum in nobis et quartum similiter in via: nostra enim scientia incipit a pluribus et est per plura; item, in via Deum cognoscimus per plura vestigia. Aliud autem medium non est reperire nisi in Christo et angelica creatura: anima enim

28 phantasiam: fantasiam MS.

59 multa per unum (cf. linn. 61-64): per multa unum MS.

27 supra: vide q. 2, num. 20.

32-33 Coniungebantur ... puncto: cf. q. 2, num. 19.

Christi per unicam formam, quae est unus habitus a Deo sibi datus ab initio creationis, scit omnia.

- 65 12 Item, scientia et virtus perfectiones sunt animae. Sed anima Christi perfecta fuit scientia omnium. Ergo similiter perfecta fuit dilectione omnium. Ergo caritate dilexit omnia.

- 13 Solutio: Ab initio datus fuit unus habitus animae Christi quo scivit omnia, nec ille habitus fuit donum scientiae quoniam dono scientiae non scit omnia, sed  
70 tantum scibilia illius doni. Ex illa forma data fuit intellectus Christi perfectissimus. Caritas vero est habitus gratuitus et meritorius. Unde non necesse erat ipsum diligere omnia ex caritate, sed sufficit diligere omnia amore naturali quo, quia omnia diligit et non potest amare ea quae nescit, sequitur quod omnia scit.

- 14 Item, quaeritur utrum anima Christi scivit omnia simul actu, et dictum est  
75 supra <4-6> quod sic.

15 Sed contra: Res successive sunt; ergo scientia experimentalis successiva. Non ergo simul actu scivit omnia.

- 16 Solutio: Anima scit simul actu; unde in libro septimo *De civitate Dei*: 'In caelo illo invisibili nil scitur ex parte, nil in aenigmate, nil ex similitudinis  
80 vicissitudine, nil in speculo. Evacuabitur quod est ex parte, id est, scientia, similiter et fides quae in aenigmate; non erit etiam ibi successio similitudinum.' Unde ibidem adiungit: 'Omnes cogitationes nostrae forsitan simul erunt.'

(b) <Utrum Christus habuerit omnium potentiam sicut omnium scientiam secundum quod homo?>

- 85 17 Item, beatitudo est 'status omnium bonorum congregatione perfectus' vel simul habita possessio. Quaero igitur utrum scientia aut bonitas aut potentia magis faciunt ad beatitudinem. Si dicat 'bonitas', non videtur dicere verum, quoniam

69 donum *corr. ex* dinum MS.

86 Quaero: Quae ratio MS.

72-73 quia ... scit: cf. Anselmum, *Cur Deus homo* 2.13, in *Opera omnia* 2, ed. F. S. Schmitt (Rome-Edinburgh, 1940), p. 112: 'Deinde si nihil amatur nisi quod cognoscitur: sicut nihil erit boni quod [Christus] non amet, ita nullum bonum erit quod ignoret.' (In PL 158.413B.)

78-81 In ... similitudinum: non est detectum, sed videtur referre ad doctrinam *De civ. Dei* 22.29.6 (CCL 48.861-62, PL 41.800-801) et ibid. 22.29.2 (CCL 48.858-59, PL 41.797-98). De visione beatifica cf. etiam Augustinum, *De Trinitate* 15.8.14-15.16.26 (CCL 50A.479-501, PL 42.1067-79), ad quem fortasse refert auctor in num. sequenti ('in eodem libro'), et *Epist.* 147: *De videndo Deo* (CSEL 44.274-331, PL 33.596-622).

82 Omnes ... erunt: cf. Augustinum, *De Trin.* 15.16.26 (CCL 50A.501, PL 42.1079): '... fortassis etiam non erunt uolubiles nostrae cogitationes ab aliis in alia euntes atque redeuntes, sed omnem scientiam nostram uno simul conspectu uidebimus. ...'

85 status ... perfectus: Boethius, *Philosophiae consolatio* 3, prosa 2.3 (CCL 94.38, PL 63.724A).

cuius contrarium magis impedit beatitudinem, ipsum plus facit ad beatitudinem. Sed hoc est infirmitas, quae magis impedit. Ergo potentia magis promovet. Quare  
90 ergo non habuit Christus omnium potentiam sicut omnium scientiam secundum hominem?

18 Praeterea, si reluxit in Christo homine vel in anima eius imago Dei non solum quoad scientiam sed quoad potentiam, sicut fuit omnisciens, ita debuit esse et dici omnipotens.

95 19 Solutio: Ut communiter dicitur, scientia facit ad beatitudinem et est perfectio animae, potentia non, ideoque hanc accepit, illam non habuit. Et ratio huius est quod omnipotentia duo importat, scilicet esse a se et posse omnia a se, et quod ita sit patet, quoniam si est ab alio, illud erit iam eo melius.

20 Item, si posse haberet ab alio, illud esset potentius. Unde ad hoc quod sit  
100 omnipotens, necesse est ut habeat esse a se et posse a se. Haec duo nulli creaturae natura inesse patitur quoniam si est creatura, est a Creatore. Sed anima Christi est creatura. Ergo non est omnipotens.

(c) <De comparatione scientiae animae Christi ad scientiam increatam>

21 Item, quaeritur de comparatione scientiae creatae ad increatam. Anima  
105 Christi scivit omnia. Ergo in hoc non excelebat scientia increata. Si dicat quod haec creata, illa increata, sic non dicis excessum, sed causam essendi. Si dicat quod in modo, contra: Scientia creata impermixta fuit omni contrariae ignorantiae. Si dicat: 'Poterat recipere permixtionem', ego quaero de actuali limpiditate.

22 Item, in quo communi participant respectu cuius dicitur excessus?  
110 23 Solutio: Impermixtio quandoque importat remotionem nescientiae sive ignorantiae, quandoque importat remotionem<75rb>onem passibilitatis ex parte susceptivi, id est, ipsius recipientis: haec est in animabus sanctis, sed aliae duae non, quoniam usque ad diem iudicii plura scient quam nunc scient. Est et tertia impermixtio, quae importat remotionem coniunctionis ad ipsum speculum. Primae  
115 duae impermixtiones fuerunt in scientia animae Christi, tertia non, et ideo potest dici limpidior scientia increata quam scientia animae Christi. Inter scientias autem creatas limpidissima fuit scientia animae Christi.

24 Ad aliud [22] dicimus quod in hoc quod Deus scit omnia et anima Christi scit omnia participant scientia animae Christi et scientia Dei. Sed in hoc est  
120 excessus quod Deus scit in se causa, anima scit non in se causa. Est tamen illa participatio proportionalis quoniam in effectu quodam participant, sicut cum dico: 'Deus est iustior Petro', iustitia creata et increata non communicant in essentia sed in effectu, qui est reddere unicuique quod suum est. Ita in effectu quodam hic communicat scientia creata et increata, qui est scire omnia.

## &lt;Quaestio 4&gt;

<II, 90vb> *Quaeritur de scientia Christi hominis secundum quod homo*(a) <*Utrum fuerit tantum una scientia Christi*>

1 Sed quaeritur, cum una sit tantum scientia Petri propter unionem animae ad corpus, quare non erit tantum una scientia Christi hominis propter unionem  
5 divinitatis ad animam; nam dicitur quod duas habuit, unam creatam et aliam increatam.

2 Respondeo quod habuit scientiam creatam, et hoc fuit necesse propter necessitatem *assimilandi* se similibus *absque peccato*. Unde ad integritatem humanae naturae oportuit quod assumeret intellectum, et sic scientiam creatam et sic  
10 scientiam increatam. Nec dico quod assumpsit tantum potentiam intelligendi omnia quia omnia sciebat actu scientia creata, ut sicut habebat ad hoc potentiam, ita potentia compleretur secundum universalem actum. Et dicimus quod Christus secundum quod homo duas habuit scientias creatas, unam quae est secundum viam  
15 scilicet de his quae inferiora sunt, ut eam quae est ad superiora vocemur intellectivam, eam vero quae est ad inferiora rationalem vel ratiocinativam. Secundum autem viam superiorem anima sciebat actu.

(b) <*Utrum Christus scientia ratiocinativa omnia sciret actu*>

3 Sed quaeritur de scientia quae est secundum viam inferiorem, utrum omnia  
20 sciret actu, quod non verum, quia super illud: *Sedebat inter scribas et pharisaeos*, dicit *Glossa*: 'Discebat in terris qui angelos docebat in caelis.' Ergo discebat actu. Ergo non omnia sciebat actu.

4 Item, ex auctoritate Damasceni qui dicit: 'Ignorantem et servilem assumpsit naturam.'

25 5 Item, super dictum <91ra> locum in Lc dicit *Glossa*: 'Sicut est carnis aetate proficere, sic est animae rationalis sapientia et gratia.'

8 *post peccato add. ad et del.* MS. 11 sciebat; sanctebat MS. scientia *corr. s.s. ex potentia*  
MS. 14 vero: *in marg.* MS. viam: unam MS. 16 inferiora *corr. ex intiferiora* MS.  
ratiocinativam: rationacivam MS. 21 discebat<sup>2</sup>: dictu MS. 26 sapientia et gratia: sapientiam  
et gratiam MS.

7-8 necesse ... peccato: cf. Heb 2:17 (*Unde debuit per omnia fratribus simili* ...) et Heb 4:15 (*... tentatum autem per omnia pro similitudine absque peccato*).

20 Sedebat ... pharisaeos: cf. Lc 2:46: *Invenerunt illum sedentem in medio doctorum*.

21 Discebat ... caelis: cf. Gregorium, *In Hiezechielem prophetam* 1, hom. 2, num. 3 (CCL 142.18, PL 76.796b-c), cit. supra, q. 2, n. ad lin. 22.

23-24 Ignorantem ... naturam: Joannes Damascenus, *De fide orth.* 3.21 (PG 94.1084b), Burg., c. 65.1 (p. 261).

25-26 Sicut ... gratia: *Glossa ord.* in Lc 2:52 (imperfecte in PL 114.252A, plenius apud Lyranum 5.132va). Cf. supra, q. 2, n. ad linn. 10-14.

6 Item, dicit: 'Quae implebatur erat non Dei sapientia.'

7 Item, dicunt Bernardus et Anselmus quod aliquid discebat per modum experientiae.

30 8 Item, ad Heb: *Didicit multa* etc., unde locum illum, scilicet quod *Filius nescit de die illa*, exponit Bernardus de scientia experientiae quia nondum audivit Filius tubam quae tunc canit et consimilia quae tunc fient.

9 Item, cum habeat Christus homo visum et alios sensus, immutatus est eis sicut alius homo. Ergo similiter immutantur intellectus et imaginatio. Ergo sicuti  
35 ex impressionibus in sensu fit impressio in imaginationem, eodem modo ascendendo fiet immutatio usque ad intellectum et in ipso intellectu. Ergo secundum diversitatem immutationum erunt ibi diversae receptiones et impressiones novae, et ita diversae scientiae novae, et ita discebat nova et augebatur scientia in tempore in quantum homo et omnia sciret in quantum anima unita erat divinitati.

40 10 Contra: Super illud in Ps: *Ponam in salutari*, dicit *Glossa*: 'Non dicit quid', per quod innuit quod posuit quidquid habere potuit. Ergo posuit scientiam omnium quam habere potuit secundum viam inferiorem, scilicet secundum inferiorem partem rationis.

28 discebat: dicebat MS. 30 Didicit: Dedit MS. 33 eis: eos MS. 34 immutantur: immutatur MS. 34-35 sicuti ex: ex sicuti MS. 41 habere: herabe MS. 42 post secundum<sup>2</sup> add. viam et del. MS.

27 Quae ... sapientia: textus derivatur a *Glossa ord.* in Lc 2:52, sub nomine Gregorii (apud Lyrarum 5.133ra); pro textu *Glossae ord.* vide supra, q. 2, num. 16.

28-29 dicunt ... experientiae: cf. Bernardum, *De gradibus humilitatis et superbiae* 3.9, in *Opera omnia* 3, edd. J. Leclercq et H.-M. Rochais (Rome, 1963), p. 23: '... in passione expertus est misericordiam, et in subiectione oboedientiam. Per quam tamen experientiam, non illi, ut dixi, scientia, sed nobis fiducia crevit, dum ex hoc misero genere cognitionis, is a quo longe erravimus, factus est propior nobis.' (In PL 182.946c-d).

Cf. Anselmum, *Cur Deus homo* 1.9, in *Opera omnia* 2, ed. F. S. Schmitt (Rome-Edinburgh, 1940), p. 62: 'Verbum autem quod positum est, "didicit", duobus modis intelligi potest. Aut enim "didicit" dictum est pro: alios fecit discere, aut quia quod per scientiam non ignorabat, experimento didicit.' (In PL 158.371b.)

30 Didicit multa: cf. Heb. 5:8: ... *didicit ex iis, quae passus est, oboedientiam*. ...

30-31 Filius ... illa: cf. Mc 13:32 et Mt 24:36.

31-32 exponit ... fient: cf. Bernardum, *De gradibus* 3.10 (ed. cit. 3.23-24, PL 182.947a-b).

40 Ponam in salutari: Ps 11:6 Non ... quid: cf. *Glossam Lombardi* in Ps 11:6 (PL 191.156c): 'Ponam in salutari [Aug., Cassiod.] id est in Jesu non in servis. Non dicit quid ponat, sed sciendum est quia ad pauperes consolandos pertinet.'

Cf. Augustinum, *Enarr. in Ps* 11:6 (CCL 38.83, PL 36.139): '*Ponam in salutari*. Non dixit quid ponat; sed *in salutari*, in Christo accipiendum est. ... Et ideo intellegitur in illo posuisse quod ad miseriam inopum auferendam et consolandum gemitum pauperum pertinet', et Cassiodorum, *Expositio Psalmorum*, in Ps 11:6 (CCL 97.119-20): '*Ponam super salutari meo*. ... *Salutare* suum dicit Pater Verbum suum, quod est caro factum. ... Et quid super eum ponit? Consolationem scilicet, quam superius dixit inopum et pauperum, quod Domino Salvatore resurgente, fidelibus prouenisse manifestum est.'

11 Contra, Hieronymus: 'A principio conceptionis suae fuit vir, non dico  
45 aetate sed perfectione scientiae.'

12 Item, super illud: *Jesus proficiebat* etc., dicit Gregorius: 'Iuxta hominis naturam proficiebat sapientia, non quod ex tempore sapientior foret quia ab ipsa conceptionis hora' etc.

13 Ad primam autem partem facit illud in Mt quod *diabolus ostendit illi omnia*  
50 *regna mundi* etc.

14 Respondeo quia anima Christi duas habuit facies, sicut quodlibet medium  
duas habet facies ad suas extremitates. Secundum unam erat anima Christi unita  
Verbo et sic deiformis erat, et secundum illam habebat scientiam omnium creatura-  
rum et cognitionem totius Trinitatis et amorem. Unde cum secundum illam faciem  
55 cognosceret Verbum, et ipso Verbo omnia cognoscebat (sicut sol seipsum prius  
ostendit et in se altera). Sic anima Christi hominis secundum faciem superiorem  
prout erat unita Verbo, in ipso Verbo omnia cognoscebat.

15 Item, anima Christi, prout erat carni unita, erat conformis ipsi carni, unde  
secundum hanc visionem trahebat per visum et alios sensus cognitionem rerum  
60 instrumentis sensus secundum res istas particulares prout eius sensibus subicieban-  
tur. Unde anima Christi assimilabatur utrique, scilicet divinitati secundum viam  
iuxta faciem superiorem et carni secundum viam inferiorem. Et sicut super locum  
illum quod non debent mulieres plorare dicit Beda quod angeli per sensum possunt  
aliqua scire cum tamen sint sine corpore, multo fortius anima Christi per sensum  
65 potest aliqua scire prout est unita carni.

16 Et bene concedimus quod a sensu aliquid relinquebatur in imaginatione,  
scilicet quaedam species, et ab imaginatione <in> intellectu quaedam species [*cf.*  
9], et hoc si ipse volebat, quia aliter non. Unde dicimus quod si volebat, poterat  
immutari eius anima secundum illam scientiam; non tamen erat plus sciens quam  
70 ante, neque magis aut melius sciebat quam ante. Sicut cum modo scias quod nix  
est alba, si audias ab alio quod nix est alba, non propter hoc magis scis quam prius

45 perfectione: perfectionem MS. 51 habuit *corr. ex* habet MS. 53 deiformis: deformis  
MS. habebat: habeat MS. 61 assimilabatur: assimiliabatur MS. 62 iuxta: videtur MS.  
viam: viam MS. 63 plorare: orare MS. 64 aliqua *corr. ex* aliquas MS.

44-45 A ... scientiae: cf. Hieronymum, *In Hieremiam* 6.22.7, in Jer 31:32 (CCL 74.313, PL 24.914D-915A), cit. supra, q. 2, num. 18. Cf. *ibid.*, n. ad linn. 79-81.

46 Jesus proficiebat: Lc 2:52.

46-48 Iuxta ... hora: cf. Bedam, cit. supra, q. 2, num. 16.

49-50 diabolus ... mundi: Mt 4:8.

63 non ... plorare: cf. Lc 23:28: *Conversus autem ad illas [mulieres] Iesus, dixit: Filiae Ierusalem, nolite flere super me. ...*

63-65 angeli ... carni: non invenitur in Beda, *In Lucae evang. expositio* 6, in Lc 23:28 (CCL 120.400, PL 114.346C-D).

quia scientia quam habes de albedine nivis est in tuo verbo. Sic scientia quae erat in Christo de omnibus erat in Verbo. Unde sua scientia quoad certitudinem scientiae non crescebat sed <quo>ad novum modum sciendi qui cadebat in eius

75 anima si volebat.

17 Posset tamen aliter dici, ut videtur, quod licet in instrumentis sensuum diversae fierent immutationes prout ipsis diversae res subicerentur, ita tamen quod nihil ex illa immutatione relinqueretur in imaginatione ipsius, cum prius actu haberet anima imaginationes omnium rerum; sicut si tu modo rem aliquam  
80 imaginaveris et continue et perseveranter, et interim res eadem sensui tuo subiceretur, quamdiu duraret prior imaginatio impossibile esset aliam imaginationem imprimi vel relinqui in te ex illa re, et hoc quia illa imaginatio quae est de eadem re in te erat sicut anima Christi: a Verbo haberet omnem modum absque sensu cognoscendi aliquid et ita a Verbo haberet imaginationem omnium actu. Non  
85 videtur quod ex formis his sensibilibus alia oriretur imaginatio in ipso. — Sed si dicatur non ita esse in imaginatione vel phantasiis quae sunt circa rationem, tamen videtur quod intellectus non posset actu immutari secundum ea secundum quae iam mutatus erat, ut scilicet secundum viam inferiorem non posset immutari intellectus cum iam formatus esset eadem scientia secundum viam superiorem.

90 18 Alii autem dicunt quod Jesus proficiebat sapientia et discebat et sic de aliis quia ad modum proficientis et discentis se habuit.

19 Alii dicunt quod proficiebat quoad alios, non in se, unde Joannes Damascenus: 'Proficere dicebatur sapientia: eam quae sibi inerat sapientiam <91rb> in manifestationem ducens.'

95 20 Alii dicunt: Proficiebat sapientia quia sapientiam aliorum suam reputabat.

21 Quod dicit Damascenus: 'Ignorantem et servilem assumpsit naturam' [4], intelligendum est non de ignorantia quam habebat sed de ignorantia humanae naturae quam assumpsit; unde subdit: 'propter identitatem personae ditata est anima futurorum cognitione', et hoc quantum ad primam faciem secundum quam

100 fuit unio animae ad deitatem.

22 Ad istud autem quod dicitur, scilicet quod recipiebat immutationes et speciem novam in intellectu [9], dicimus: Si volebat, non tamen veniebat de

72 tuo: ser *et del.* MS. 73 Verbo: sermo MS. sua: si MS. 77 immutationes: unitionem MS.  
78 imaginatione: ymaginatione MS. 79 imaginationes: inmaginationes MS.  
86 phantasiis: fantasiis MS. 87 actu: auctu MS. 90 Jesus: Jol (*corr. ex Johl*) MS. discebat *corr. s.s. ex dicebat* MS.  
92 proficiebat: profiebat MS. 93 inerat: inenar MS. 94 manifestationem: manifestonem MS.  
95 *post* dicunt *add.* profiebat MS. 96 dicit: autem MS.  
97 habebat: habebant MS. 98 identitatem: indeptitatem MS. ditata *corr. ex* digtata MS.

93-94 Proficere ... ducens: cf. supra, q. 2, num. 17, et n. ad linn. 67-69.

98-99 propter ... cognitione: cf. supra, q. 2, num. 18, et n. ad linn. 81-83.

scientia in scientiam sed de inexperientia in experientiam, vel quia novum modum sciendi habebat, ut dictum est [16].

- 105 23 Quod autem obicitur de illa glossa: 'Non dicit quid' etc. [10], dicimus quod dedit ei quidquid dare potuit quoad fruitionem et quantum ad ea quae sunt secundum partem superiorem, hoc est, secundum unionem animae ad Verbum, non autem secundum unionem animae ad carnem sive secundum inferiorem viam.

(c) <Utrum Christus ratiocinando posset devenire de ignoto ad notum>

- 110 24 Item, quaeritur, cum receperit immutationes exteriores et sic novo modo sciret, an ratiocinando posset devenire de ignoto ad notum. Quod videtur quod habebat vim rationalem et excogitandi et sic <de> aliis, ad minus secundum viam inferiorem.

25 Contra: Dicit Damascenus quod 'consilium in eo non requirimus.'

- 115 26 Respondeo quod poterat, ut dictum est [16-17], illas immutationes exteriores recipere, sed <non> propter hoc ex eis ratiocinabatur quia ratiocinatio ex indigentia est vel provenit. Unde Augustinus quaerit de scientia hominis cuiuslibet quomodo potest aliquis addiscere quia aut scit illud quod addiscit aut non; si scit, ergo non addiscit; si nescit, quomodo ergo potest in scientiam venire quia  
120 quomodo inquireret de eo quod nescit? Et respondet Augustinus quia in parte scit, in parte nescit, quia in parte non scit quod est in inquisitione ut plane sciat et ratiocinatione. Sic non est in Christo, quia ad plenum habuit scientiam, non in parte, quia in parte est labor, et licet secundum carnem, scilicet secundum infantiam, posset adolescere et crescere, non sic fuit in scientia, sed plenam et  
125 perfectam habuit scientiam. Unde etiam scientia quam habebat secundum viam inferiorem in suo genere vel in suo modo erat plena nec indigebat discussione nec ratiocinatione ut plenior fieret, immo secundum suum modum in summo erat quia secundum viam inferiorem falli non poterat.

104 habebat: habebant MS. 110 receperit: reciperet MS. 112 habebat: habebant MS.  
117 hominis: hominis MS. 118 addiscit: addicit MS. scit<sup>2</sup> corr. s.s. ex non MS.  
121 in inquisitione corr. s.s. ex inquisitione MS. 124 posset corr. ex pset MS. adolescere:  
adole MS. 125 habebat: habebant MS.

114 consilium ... requirimus: cf. *De fide orth.* 2.22 (PG 94.948A), Burg., c. 36.14 (p. 139): 'Neque vero in Domini anima inquisimus consilium vel electionem.' Cf. *ibid.* 3.14 (PG 94.1044B-C), Burg., c. 58.24 (pp. 225-26).

117-120 Augustinus ... nescit: cf. Augustinum, *De magistro* 10.33 (CCL 29.192, PL 32.1214): 'Quid? quod si diligentius consideremus, fortasse nihil inuenies, quod per sua signa discatur. Cum enim mihi signum datur, si nescientem me inuenerit, cuius rei signum sit, docere me nihil potest, si uero scientem, quid disco per signum?'

120-122 respondet ... ratiocinatione: cf. (ad sensum) *ibid.* 10.33 (CCL 29.192, linn. 125-34, PL 32.1214), et 12.40 (CCL 29.197-99, PL 32.1217-18).



27 Item, cum secundum omnem sensum habuit experimentum, et ex multi-  
 130plici sensu formetur unum experimentum et ex multiplici experimento unus  
 intellectus qui est principium artis et scientiae, cum ipse habuit notitiam principio-  
 rum quae sunt principia artis et scientiae, videtur quod ad hoc secundum colla-  
 tionem pervenerit et ita ratiocinando.

28 Respondeo: Sicut enim ex praedictis apparet, multipliciter habuit experi-  
 135mentum, non tamen multiplicem scientiam, scilicet propter summam cognitionem  
 quam desuper habebat, et posset sumere principium artis et scientiae in altero, non  
 in se.

29 Item, notatur quod dupliciter sit electio, quaedam in motu et quaedam in  
 termino motus: quod primo modo non fuit in Christo, scilicet prout est in motu,  
 140sed prout est in termino motus, unde in ipso fuit consilium [*cf.* 25], consilium non  
 unde consulens sed unde consultus. Sic iudicium fuit in ipso, non ut in motu sed  
 ut in termino motus. Unde etsi mutationes in eo fiebant instrumentis sensus, etsi  
 etiam in ipso relinquerentur phantasiae aut imaginationes, non tamen ut secundum  
 naturam aut per naturam motus aut per modum motus sed ut in termino, unde  
 145nulla erat in eo ratiocinatio.

(d) <Utrum superfluerit in Christo cognitio per experientiam>

30 Item, quaeritur: Cum intellectus Christi secundum viam superiorem cog-  
 nosceret non tantum universalialia sed etiam particularia, ita cognoscebat et inferiora  
 et superiora: cum, inquam, ita esset, ad quid fuit ei data cognitio per experientiam?  
 150Videtur enim quod superfluat.

31 Respondeo: Ut per hoc ostenderet se nobis esse similem. Et etiam alia  
 ratione, quia etsi cognosceret secundum viam superiorem, ut dictum est [2, 15],  
 tamen ipsa aggregatio facit iucunditatem propter ipsa particularia, unde etsi summa  
 delectatio sit in videndo Deum, tamen in videndo sanctos multae erunt ibi  
 155delectationes particulares nec superfluent. Illa tamen quae erit de visione Dei  
 summa erit; nihilominus alia maior erit propter aggregationem.

(e) <Utrum Christus habuerit scientiam divinam sive increatam tantum>

32 Item, videtur quod Christus non habuit nisi scientiam divinam, quia dicit  
 <Augustinus>: 'Quidquid intellexit, quidquid scit, Deus est.' Ergo non habet  
 160scientiam nisi increatam.

136 habebat: habebant MS.

143 phantasiae: fantasiae MS.

144 unde *bis et del.* unde MS.

153 iucunditatem: iocunditatem MS.

154 ibi s.s. MS.

156 maior: maiore MS.

159 Augustinus: cf. supra, q. 2, num. 11, ubi idem dictum datur.  
 n. ad linn. 39-40.

Quidquid ... est: cf. ibid.,

33 Respondeo per simile: Dicitur quod in patria sensus convertetur in imaginationem, imaginatio in rationem, ratio in intellectum, non quia in veritate sensus fiat imaginatio aut imaginatio ratio aut ratio intellectus, sed quia sensus maiores delectationes habebit quam modo propter potentias. Sicut ego delector modo in  
 165 isto homine <91va> pulchro; multo plus delectarer in ipso si esset frater meus. Eodem modo propter adiuncta plus delectabitur sensus quam modo, et similiter imaginatio, et sic de aliis. Sic ergo in Christo divinitas illuminabat intellectum, intellectus rationem, ratio imaginationem, imaginatio sensum, unde quando divinitas influebat usque ad sensum, hoc modo 'quidquid intelligit, quidquid scit,  
 170 Deus <est>', non propter scientiam increatam, sed quia divinitas seipsam influebat usque ad sensum, ut dictum est [17].

34 Item, nota quod praedictis non obstat quod dicitur in Jo: *Priusquam <te Philippus vocaret, cum> esses sub ficu, novi te*, quia loquitur de visione divinitatis et Christus secundum intellectum fruebatur Deo, secundum vero ratiocinativam  
 175 fruebatur se in Deo.

(f) <Utrum scientia creata in Christo aequalis sit scientiae increatae in ipso>

35 Item, quaeritur sic: Scientia increata inaequalis est creatae quia una substantia, alia accidens; ergo inproportionalia. Sed maior est omnium sciens. Ergo creata non est omnium sciens.

180 36 Item, ubi est scientia actu, ibi est scientia, sciens, et scibile. Ergo in anima Christi est ita. Secundum quid est sciens? Sed in quantum Deus est sciens. Similiter sunt ibi tria praedicta. Sed haec tria in Deo sunt digniora quam in anima Christi quia etiam scitum, in quantum scitum est a Deo, dignius est quam scitum ab anima Christi; ergo inproportionalia, et inde ut prius. Quod si concedatur, quid est ergo  
 185 quod dicitur quod anima Christi habet similem scientiam cum divinitate eius?

37 Contra: Nihil scit homo quod non sciat anima eius. Ergo similiter nihil scit Christus quod non sciat anima eius. Ergo scientia Christi et animae eius sunt aequales in summo, et etiam in intensione; ergo proportionales, quod supra negatum est [36].

190 38 Respondeo quod scientiae istae respectu scitorum aequales sunt sed non in alio respectu. Sicut dicitur quod duae ulnae eiusdem longitudinis aequales sunt licet una sit grossior altera; unde si una sit lignea, altera ferrea, nihilominus

162 veritate: ulitate MS.

ymaginationem, ymaginatio MS.

MS. 179 omnium: omnim MS.

MS. 189 negatum: ngatum MS.

167 imaginatio: ymaginatio MS.

177 creatae: increatae MS.

186 Contra: Item MS.

190 scitorum: scientiarum MS.

168 imaginationem, imaginatio:

178 sciens corr. ex scientiarum

188 in intensione: inintentione

192 grossior: grotior MS.

172-173 Priusquam ... te: cf. Jo 1:48 (*Priusquam ... te Philippus vocaret, cum esses sub ficu, vidi te*).

aequales sunt in quantum sunt mensurabiles, non autem in quantum sunt res. Sic  
 195 scientia animae Christi et scientia Dei uno modo aequales sunt quoad numerum  
 scitorum, alio autem modo non.

(g) <Utrum anima Christi sit omnipotens>

39 Item, quaeritur: Anima Christi unita Verbo habet potentiam, scientiam sive  
 cognitionem, bonitatem sive amorem. Duo ultima ita habet quod omnia scit, omnia  
 diligit. Ergo tertium habet ita quod omnia potest. Ergo est omnipotens.

200 40 Respondeo quod potentia est respectu futurorum, scientia est respectu  
 existentium, unde scientia et illud respectu cuius est scientia simul sunt. Potentia  
 autem praecedit respectu illius cuius est potentia; unde comparatio potentiae ad  
 actum est ut praecedentis ad consequens in esse. Anima autem Christi est creata.  
 Ergo est ut sequens respectu potentiae a qua suum esse elicatum est. Sed si esset  
 205 omnipotens, et ita potens esset respectu sui ipsius, ergo ratione potentiae praecede-  
 ret suum esse et ita esset et praecedens et similiter sequens, quod esse non potest.

41 Item, cum anima Christi a se non sit creata nec potest seipsam creare,  
 relinquitur quod non sit omnipotens, et ita non potuit habere potentiam omnium  
 sicut scientiam et amorem, quia scientia et amor sunt respectu existentium.

193 sic: sicut MS.  
 s.s. ex ipsam MS.

206 similiter sequens *corr.* s.s. ex exsequens MS.  
 209 *post sunt add.* sunt MS.

207 seipsam *corr.*

# A CRITICAL EDITION OF THE ANTI-ARSENITE DISCOURSES OF THEOLEPTOS OF PHILADELPHEIA\*

*Robert E. Sinkewicz, C.S.B.*

## INTRODUCTION

THE importance of the two discourses edited here was first detailed by S. Salaville in an article published in 1947.<sup>1</sup> Both are concerned with an affair known as the Arsenite Schism.<sup>2</sup> When Michael VIII Palaeologus blinded the young John IV Laskaris, the legitimate heir to the throne, and assumed the supreme power himself, he was excommunicated by the patriarch Arsenios (1262). The patriarch obstinately refused to bend to the political realities and was deposed (1265). The new patriarch, Germanos, was opposed by those who considered his election uncanonical and he was forced to abdicate (1266). Joseph, who was next on the patriarchal throne, absolved the emperor of the excommunication (1267). As a defender of the Laskarid dynasty, Patriarch Arsenios had many followers in Asia Minor and they quickly rose to support his cause. Thus began a schism between Arsenites and Josephites that plagued the empire till the first decade of the next century, when the controversy was finally resolved in 1310.

Apart from its political aspects, the affair involved serious ecclesiastical questions. While a validly appointed patriarch is still alive, he cannot be legitimately deposed even by the emperor (except, of course, in a situation involving heresy). Nevertheless, the church had in fact tolerated such situations in the past. A further

\* The research for this article was funded by a grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

Abbreviations are used in this article for the titles of the anti-Arsenite Discourses:

PD 1 = Philadelphian Discourse 1

PD 2 = Philadelphian Discourse 2

<sup>1</sup> 'Deux documents inédits sur les dissensions religieuses byzantines entre 1275 et 1310', *Revue des études byzantines* 5 (1947) 116-36.

<sup>2</sup> The major works on the Arsenite schism are as follows. J. Sykoutres, 'Περὶ τοῦ σχίσματος τῶν Ἀρσενιατῶν', *Ἑλληνικά* 2 (1929) 257-332, 3 (1930) 15-44 and 5 (1932) 107-126; V. Laurent, 'La question des Arsénites', *Ἑλληνικά* 3 (1930) 463-70 and 'Les grandes crises religieuses à Byzance: la fin du schisme arsénite', *Bulletin de la section historique, Académie roumaine* 26 (1945) 225-313; J. Darrouzès, *Documents inédits d'ecclésiologie byzantine* (Archives de l'Orient chrétien 11; Paris, 1970), pp. 86-106, 340-413; A. Failler, 'Chronologie et composition dans l'Histoire de Georges Pachymère', *REB* 38 (1980) 5-103 (especially 39-77).

pretext for the controversy was found in a rumour being circulated, to the effect that Joseph had been excommunicated by Arsenios. If this were true, Joseph's election would certainly be invalid.<sup>3</sup> Furthermore, this would entail the invalidity of all jurisdictional acts of such a patriarch. Thus, all ordinations approved or performed by him would be null and void. Any priests or bishops accepting communion with the patriarch would likewise incur excommunication.

The effects of the controversy are ably described by the historian, George Pachymeres.

In truth the schism in the Church at that time continued to grow to such a point that even within households families were divided, the father adopting one position and a son another, and similarly with mother and daughter, daughter-in-law and mother-in-law. The most numerous [among the schismatics] were the monks in Hyacinth's party, an unstable lot who wandered from place to place, agitating on behalf of the exiled patriarch [Arsenios]. But there were others, too, renowned for their virtue, who came from Galesios and other monasteries, like those who resided at that time in the monastery of Pantepoptes.... The monks of the Pantepoptes monastery grew bold and with the greatest audacity set out to attack the patriarch in charge [Joseph], both because he was a usurper and because he had been excommunicated.<sup>4</sup>

From that moment on, the affairs of the Church took a turn for the worse, and men separated from one another; one group maintained communion with a particular group in the sacred assemblies, while others held strictly to the rule, "Take not, touch not", even in sharing drink and conversation. Schism prevailed, and the man who yesterday placed his full confidence in someone turned away from him the next day. Indeed, the earlier schism over Arsenios was bad enough, when this second schism arose as well. On the one hand, both involved the very worst sort of maladies and, as far as they were able, brought ruin upon the great and undivided body of the Church. On the other hand, they were quite irreconcilable among themselves; in turn, the members of each party were in mutual disagreement, some regarding the schism in one way and others in another, some with a moderate attitude, others with a rigorist attitude.<sup>5</sup>

As indicated in the notes to the translation below, there are some interesting similarities between these comments by Pachymeres and the observations made by Theoleptos. Moreover, similarities can be discerned in other documents of the Arsenite controversy: viz. in the treatise published by Humphry Hody;<sup>6</sup> Methodios,

<sup>3</sup> On this question see V. Laurent, 'L'excommunication du patriarche Joseph I<sup>er</sup> par son prédécesseur Arsène', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 30 (1929-30) 489-96.

<sup>4</sup> Pachymeres 4.28, ed. A. Failler, *Georges Pachymères, Relations historiques*, 2 vols. (Corpus fontium historiae byzantinae 24.1-2; Paris, 1984).

<sup>5</sup> Pachymeres 5.23.

<sup>6</sup> *Anglicani novi schismatis redargutio, seu tractatus ex historiis ecclesiasticis quo ostenditur episcopus, injuste licet depositos, orthodoxi successoris communionem numquam refugisse* (Oxford, 1691).

*De schismate vitando* (1275/1276)<sup>7</sup> and his *Letter to Gregory II* (1286/1288);<sup>8</sup> Kallistos, *Letter to Manuel Disypatos* (1275/1276);<sup>9</sup> John Cheilas, *Against the Arsenites* (1296).<sup>10</sup> The Hody treatise, the *De schismate* of Methodios and the letter of Kallistos are devoted primarily to the consideration of canonical questions and are little more than florilegia with occasional comments. These comments, however, resemble statements made by Theoleptos.

Methodios, both in his treatise and in his letter to the patriarch remarked on the Arsenites' unreasonable insistence on ἀκριβεία, that is, their attitude of rigorism in canonical matters.

One who, for the sake of a rigorist application of some canon, causes trouble, creates factions and schism within the body of the church which is preserved by its religious orthodoxy, even if he thinks he is motivated by piety, such a person has forgotten himself. On the outside he is like a wolf that comes along in sheep's clothing and on the inside he is filled with deceit and rapacity.<sup>11</sup>

In a similar vein, Theoleptos compared the 'rigorism' of the Arsenites with that of the Jews.

But if, while claiming they are contending for a rigorist position and struggling on behalf of orthodoxy, they both proclaim and do such things in order to justify themselves with such words, let them know that 'they are making excuses for their sins (Ps 140:4).' The refutation follows close on their heels. If they can justify themselves on these grounds, then the Jews too are entirely free of guilt, for however many unlawful deeds they committed against Christ, these they did because they were apparently holding to the law and thought they were acting piously, pleasing God. If then the Jews are just on this account, those who overturn the church on the pretext of a rigorist position will be found free of condemnation.<sup>12</sup>

Near the end of his letter to Manuel Disypatos, the monk Kallistos raised the question of whether grace is operative in unworthy priests and bishops. In favour of this position he cited a text of John Chrysostom.

Along with many other texts, the great Chrysostom in his *Commentary on the First Letter to the Corinthians* indicates that grace is operative in unworthy priests and

<sup>7</sup> PG 140:781-805

<sup>8</sup> Ed. V. Laurent and J. Darrouzès, *Dossier grec de l'Union de Lyon (1273-1277)* (Archives de l'Orient chrétien 16; Paris, 1976), pp. 91-92 (commentary), 518-27 (text and translation).

<sup>9</sup> Ed. J. Sykoutres, 'Περὶ τοῦ σχίσματος τῶν Ἀρσενιατῶν', *Ἑλληνικά* 3 (1930) 15-44.

<sup>10</sup> Ed. Darrouzès, *Documents inédits*, pp. 86-106 (commentary), 340-413 (text).

<sup>11</sup> *De schismate vitando* 14 (PG 140:797AB). Cf. *Letter to Gregory II*, ed. Laurent and Darrouzès, *Dossier grec*, p. 525.23-526.11.

<sup>12</sup> PD 2.11. Cf. PD 2.25: 'And if any God-fearing man ever asks them, "Brothers, where is the church? Where are the holy rites?", they immediately feign zeal and make a show of their rigorist position. Then, like wild beasts, they set upon him, desiring to tear his flesh apart with their own hands.'

bishops. He makes the following statement: 'It can happen that lay people live pious lives and priests wicked lives, and if grace were to require worthiness in every instance, there would be neither baptism nor body of Christ nor offering through those priests. But now, God customarily works even through unworthy ministers and the grace of baptism is in no way hampered by the life of the priest, since the recipient would have suffered loss. He says this that no one, in learning about the priest's way of life, may find the sacraments a stumbling block, for man does not offer the sacraments; rather, they are entirely the work of God's power, and it is he who confers the sacraments on us.'<sup>13</sup>

The issue of sinful priests and bishops is raised also by John Cheilas,<sup>14</sup> but nowhere in the anti-Arsenite literature is it treated more extensively than in the two Philadelphian Discourses of Theoleptos. The metropolitan counselled his people against breaking off communion with their priests for reasons of moral laxity on the part of the latter. On the one hand, their own suspicions or the accusations they may have heard might turn out to be incorrect. On the other hand, even if the priest's way of life is in fact mediocre, his counsel can still be of great benefit for one's salvation. Theoleptos illustrated his point with the image of the dandelion and the wheat, and then criticized this tendency among the Arsenites as inspired by spiritual pride.<sup>15</sup>

For the jealous demon makes each man captured by such a passion think that he alone possesses virtue and understanding, while all other men are sinners and fools.<sup>16</sup>

Finally, near the end of his second discourse, Theoleptos recounted 'a story of the Fathers' regarding the celebration of the Eucharist by a priest who had committed the sin of adultery. The conclusion drawn by Theoleptos is virtually identical with the Chrysostom text quoted by Kallistos.

Sin does not render grace ineffectual, lest there be occasion for judgement against priests from whoever wishes to lodge one; rather grace operates for the sake of the worthiness of the priesthood, so that men may learn that when we approach priests we no longer approach men but God, who through them provides us with his gifts and sanctifies us.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>13</sup> *Letter to Manuel Disypatos*, ed. Sykoutres, *Ἑλληνικά* 3 (1930) 25.16-27. Contrary to Sykoutres, the Chrysostom text is delimited as above. Cf. PG 61:69. This text is also quoted by John Cheilas, *Against the Arsenites* 4.24 (391) and by Nikon of the Black Mountain, *Pandects* 40, Paris gr. 880, fol. 219<sup>r</sup> (for further references to Cheilas' use of the *Pandects*, see Darrouzès, *Documents inédits*, pp. 363, 367).

<sup>14</sup> In *Against the Arsenites* 2.8 (364-65), Cheilas argued that sins or moral laxity on the part of a bishop cannot be taken as a pretext for schism, for sanctification can be granted through even the most sinful bishop.

<sup>15</sup> PD 1.10-12.

<sup>16</sup> PD 1.12.

<sup>17</sup> PD 2.22. Theoleptos developed the discussion at some length in PD 2.23-25.

Further it would seem that among the Arsenite dissidents there was a group with a strong penchant for spiritual idealism. Immediately after referring to the monks of Hyacinth's party, Pachymeres mentioned that 'there were others, too, *renowned for their virtue*, who came from Galesios and other monasteries.'<sup>18</sup> Galesios was an important monastic centre situated just north of Ephesus, and thus not very far from Philadelphieia.<sup>19</sup> Towards the end of the thirteenth century the bishop of Ephesus had to respond to a situation in which Arsenite priests and even unordained monks were exercising the ministry of spiritual direction (which may have included sacramental penance) without the necessary episcopal authorization. Some even claimed they had received this authorization from the monk Hyacinth who in turn had received the jurisdiction to bestow such authorization from patriarch Arsenios.<sup>20</sup>

This evidence indicates that within the Arsenite ranks there was a resurgence of that latent tendency within Byzantine Christianity which advocated such a high notion of spiritual idealism that it succumbed to the temptation of breaking away from what it perceived to be the church of the impure to form a parallel church of the holy.

Notwithstanding the many points of similarity between the Philadelphian Discourses and the other anti-Arsenite documents, the former stand out as unique because they are not so much documents of ecclesiastical controversy as they are homilies of pastoral care directed towards the circumstances of a particular Christian community in Asia Minor. Of all the anti-Arsenite literature they are the most theological in tone.

Unfortunately the two discourses cannot be dated precisely. They were written sometime between the final settlement of the Church Union problem at the Synod of Blachernai in 1285 and the resolution of the Arsenite schism in 1310.<sup>21</sup> Considering the exordium of the second discourse, Salaville suggested a date early in the author's episcopate, that is, close to 1285.<sup>22</sup> Although this suggestion has merit, it is by no means conclusive, nor can we assume that both discourses were pronounced in close chronological proximity.

<sup>18</sup> Pachymeres 4.28

<sup>19</sup> R. Janin, *Les églises et les monastères des grands centres byzantins* (Paris, 1975), pp. 241-50.

<sup>20</sup> *On the Arsenite Schism* II.8, IV.16-19 (and marginal note 10), IV.20-28.

<sup>21</sup> Theoleptos was raised to the episcopacy by Patriarch Gregory II and was one of the signatories of the Synod of Blachernai. Cf. V. Laurent, 'Les signataires du second synode des Blakhermes (été 1285)', *Echos d'Orient* 26 (1927) 129-49. In PD 2.18 Theoleptos mentioned the triumph of orthodoxy over the Latinophile policies of Michael VIII.

<sup>22</sup> 'Deux documents', *REB* 5 (1947) 120.



## THE TEXT

A = Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vaticanus graecus 1140. Sixteenth century. Paper 160 x 115 mm. Folios vii + 52. PD 1 = fols. 24r-32v, PD 2 = fols. 33r-52r.

B = Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Ottobonianus graecus 418.<sup>23</sup> Fifteenth-sixteenth century. Codex in two volumes comprising gatherings taken from originally separate manuscripts. Paper 205 x 140 mm. Folios 525 (vol. 1 = a-e/1-244; vol. 2 = 245-521). Theoleptos section: PD 1 = fols. 80r-89r, PD 2 = fols. 89r-111v.

For the text of Theoleptos' discourses MS B is the more reliable of the two manuscripts. MS. A shows a very great number of simple errors, primarily orthographic in character (e.g., PD 1.1.13 ἴλιον, 1.2.21 ἐντωλᾶς, 1.5.120 συράπτουσι). MS. B, too, is certainly not free of errors (e.g., PD 1.5.98 ἀπιστείας, 1.5.100 ἐκλησίας, 1.5.122 πραγματαινόμενοι). Occasionally both manuscripts give erroneous readings, but the recovery of the correct text seldom presents problems. In the critical apparatus all omissions are reported, as are all of my own corrections to the text. Purely orthographic errors are not noted. Old Testament references are to the Septuagint.

<sup>23</sup> E. Feron and F. Battaglini, *Codices manuscripti graeci Ottoboniani Bibliothecae Vaticanae* (Rome, 1893), pp. 229-32.

## PD 1

## Θεολήπτου Μητροπολίτου Φιλαδελφείας

Ὅτι δεῖ φεύγειν τοὺς ἀποσχιζομένους τῶν ὀρθοδόξων χριστιανῶν, προσεδρεύειν δὲ τοῖς θείοις ναοῖς, ὑπείκειν δὲ τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσι καὶ τοὺς λειτουργοὺς κυρίου αἰδεῖσθαι τε καὶ τιμᾶν

- 5 1. Ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς μετὰ τὴν τριήμερον αὐτοῦ καὶ σωτήριον ἀνάστασιν τοῖς μὲν Ἰουδαίοις ἀθέατος ἔμεινε, τοῖς δὲ ἀποστόλοις ἐμφανιζόμενος, ἐδίδου αὐτοῖς τὰ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος αὐτοῦ χαρίσματα. οἱ μὲν γὰρ Ἰουδαῖοι, ἐπειδὴ τὴν ἰδίαν δόξαν ζητοῦντες, αὐτὸν οὐκ ἐδέξαντο ἀλλ' ἀπεστράφησαν αὐτόν, διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἀνάξιοι ἐγένοντο τῶν
- 10 θείων δωρεῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰκότως· τίς γὰρ τὸν ἥλιον βδελυττόμενος τοῦ φωτισμοῦ αὐτοῦ μετέχειν δύναται καὶ τῆς λαμπρότητος; οἱ δὲ ἀπόστολοι, ἐπειδὴ τὰ ἑαυτῶν θελήματα καταλιπόντες ὀπίσω τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν μετὰ προθυμίας ἠκολούθησαν καὶ ἦσαν πρὸς αὐτόν διὰ παντὸς ἀτενίζοντες, διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τῆς γλυκυτάτης αὐτοῦ ἐμφανείας καὶ τῶν θαυμασίων αὐτοῦ
- 15 χαρίτων ἠξιοῦντο.
2. Τοιοῦτόν τι ἔσται καὶ κατὰ τὴν δευτέραν παρουσίαν τοῦ κυρίου· μετὰ γὰρ τὴν κοινήν καὶ παγκόσμιον ἀνάστασιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὅσοι μὲν τὰς σωτηρίους ἐντολὰς τοῦ σωτῆρος ἠθέτησαν καὶ ταῖς σαρκικαῖς ἐπιθυμίαις καὶ ἡδοναῖς ὀλοκλήρως ἐδοῦλευσαν, ἐσθίοντες καὶ πίνοντες καὶ
- 20 ὑπνῶτοντες, πορνεύοντες, ἀδικοῦντες, πλεονεκτοῦντες, δυναστεύοντες, ὑβρίζοντες, φθονοῦντες, μνησικακοῦντες καὶ τῶν ἀπόρων καὶ πενήτων κατεξανιστάμενοι—οὗτοι πάντες, ὥς τὸν κύριον ἀποστραφέντες καὶ μὴ πιστεύσαντες αὐτῷ περὶ τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν λαλήσαντι, εἰς τὴν τοῦ πυρὸς ἀποπεμφθήσονται Γεένναν, ἣν καὶ ἀνῆψαν αὐτοὶ διὰ τῆς ὕλης τῶν
- 25 ἰδίων ἀμαρτιῶν. ὅσοι δὲ τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ φόβον ἔλαβον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς καὶ ἐφρόντισαν φυλάξαι τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ Χριστοῦ, χρώμενοι τοῖς τοῦ θεοῦ πράγμασιν εὐλαβῶς, σωφρονοῦντες, ἀρκούμενοι ταῖς ἰδίαις γυναίξιν, δικαίως ἀναστρεφόμενοι, μηδὲνα μισοῦντες ἀλλὰ πάντας ἀγαπῶντες καὶ τιμῶντες, καὶ τὰ παρὰ τινῶν γινόμενα πρὸς αὐτοὺς λυπηρὰ μετ' εὐχαρισ-
- 30 τίας ὑπομένοντες καὶ τὸν θεὸν ἐν ἅπασιν δοξάζοντες, καὶ ἑαυτοὺς μὲν καταδικάζοντες, τοὺς δὲ ἄλλους ἀνθρώπους δικαιοῦντες ἐν γνώσει—οὗτοι

1 Μητροπολίτου add. supra B: ἐπισκόπου A Φιλαδελφείας BA 2 ὅτι δεῖ A: περὶ τοῦ B 2-3 προσεδρεύειν A 3 δεῖ deest in B ὑπείκειν δὲ coptici: ὑπείκεινται BA 9 ἐδέξασαν A<sup>ac</sup> 13 αὐτοὺς A 13-14 διατοῦτο B; διὰ τοῦ τοῦτο A 18 σωτηριώδους A<sup>ac</sup> 20 ὑπνῶτοντες coptici: ὑπνόντωντες B; ὑπνώτοντες A 28 ἀγαπόντας B, A<sup>ac</sup> 30 ἐν ἅπασιν ante ὑπομένοντες hab. A 30-31 καὶ ἑαυτοὺς μὲν καταδικάζοντες deest in B

### **Metropolitan Theoleptos of Philadelphia**

**That one must flee those who separate themselves from orthodox Christians and that one must frequent the sacred temples, submit to bishops, and respect and honour ministers of the Lord**

1. Our Lord Jesus Christ, after his saving resurrection on the third day, remained invisible to the Jews, but manifested himself to the apostles and granted them the gifts of his Holy Spirit. For since the Jews, in pursuit of their own honour, did not accept him but abandoned him, on this account they became unworthy of his divine gifts, and rightly so. For who can loathe the sun and still be able to participate in its illumination and radiance? But the apostles, since they abandoned their own wants to follow our Saviour in earnest and attended to him always, on this account they were deemed worthy of his exceeding sweet manifestation and of his wondrous gifts.

2. So will it also be at the second coming of the Lord. After the general and universal resurrection of men, those who rejected the saving commandments of the Saviour and became completely enslaved to the desires and pleasures of the flesh, eating and drinking and sleeping, fornicating, acting unjustly, defrauding others, lording it over people, mistreating them, committing murder, hating and despising those who are poor and needy—all these, since they rejected the Lord and did not believe in what he said concerning the good things to come, will be sent away to the Gehenna of fire which they themselves have ignited with the kindling of their own sins. But those who have taken the fear of God to themselves and have been anxious to keep the commandments of Christ, conducting themselves reverently in divine matters, preserving chastity, being satisfied with their own wives, conducting their affairs justly, hating no one but loving and respecting all, bearing with thanksgiving the pains inflicted upon them by others and glorifying God in all things, condemning themselves while presuming other men are acting justly—all these, because they have preferred Christ above all, shall be deemed worthy of his ineffable glory, for he shall be their delight, joy and eternal rest, giving warmth and

πάντες, ὡς τὸν Χριστὸν ἀντὶ πάντων προτιμησάμενοι, τῆς αὐτοῦ ἀνεκκλήτου δόξης ἀξιωθήσονται· αὐτὸς γὰρ ἔσται τούτοις τρυφή, χαρὰ καὶ αἰδίοις ἀνάπαυσις, περιθάλπων καὶ ζωογονῶν οὓς ὁ χειμὼν τῶν 35 ἐνταῦθα δι' αὐτὸν πειρασμῶν ἐλύπει καὶ κατεβίαζε.

3. Ταῦτα οὖν πάντα συμβάλλετε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, περιπόθητά μου τεχνία, καὶ γνόντες ὅτι ἀδύνατόν ἐστι σωθῆναι τὸν ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις ἐπιμένοντα πάντα ἄνθρωπον. ἀπόστητε ἀπὸ τῶν ὁδῶν ὑμῶν τῶν πονηρῶν, προσέλθετε πρὸς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ φωτίσθητε τῶν συνήθων ψαλμῶδίων 40 καὶ ἀναγνωσμάτων ἀκροώμενοι καὶ ἔργα ἀγαθὰ διαπραττόμενοι· καὶ αἱ συνειδήσεις ὑμῶν, ἥνικα ὁ τῆς φοβερᾶς κρίσεως καιρὸς ἐπιστῇ, οὐ καταισχυνθήσονται. φεύγετε τὰς ὀφιώδεις συμβουλὰς τῶν κακῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἀποστατῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ὅφεις γὰρ εἰσι προδήλως οἱ τοιοῦτοι ἄνθρωποι. ἐν σχήματι φιλίας καὶ δέρμασι προβάτων ἐχθροὶ καὶ λύκοι ὄντες, λύκοι 45 ὠρυόμενοι ζητοῦσι τροφήν καί, ὅταν ἀφύλακτα εὐρήσῃσι πρόβατα, ἀρπάζουσιν αὐτὰ καὶ διασπαράσσουσι. τοῦτο ποιοῦσι καὶ οἱ ἀπατεῶνες ἄνθρωποι καὶ ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, οἱ εὐλάβειαν μὲν ὑποκρινόμενοι καὶ σχῆμα πτωχείας περικεῖμενοι, ἔσθθεν δὲ ἐν τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν ἐσκοτισμένοι ὄντες, φιλήδονοι, φιλάργυροι, κενόδοξοι, ὕβρισταί, πλῆκται, φιλόνηκοι, 50 μνησικάκοι καὶ παντελῶς μαινόμενοι. βουλόμενοι γὰρ ποιεῖν τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας, εἰσέρχονται εἰς πόλεις καὶ χώρας καὶ ὠρύονται ὡς λύκοι· διδάσκουσι γὰρ ἀπέχεσθαι τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ λαὸν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἀποφεύγειν ἐκ τῶν ἀγιασμάτων, μὴ ὑποτάσσεσθαι τοῖς τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ποιμέσι. μέσον τῶν συνοικοῦντων ἀνδρογύνων εἰσάγουσι σχίσματα, συμβουλευόν- 55 τες μὴ συνεσθίειν αὐτούς, μηδὲ συμπίνειν· καὶ τέλος πειρῶνται λαβεῖν ἐξ αὐτῶν χρήματά τινα. καὶ ὅταν δυνηθῶσιν ἐλκύσαι τινὰς εἰς τὸ διαβολικὸν αὐτῶν φρόνημα καὶ ὑποταγῆναι αὐτοῖς, τότε ἀρπάζουσιν τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν χριστιανῶν καὶ παραπέμπουσιν αὐτὰς εἰς τὴν γαστέρα τοῦ δαίμονος. καὶ οὕτως κατασχίζουσι τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκλησίαν. ὅσοι γὰρ κρατηθῶσιν εἰς τὴν 60 διδασκαλίαν αὐτῶν, μάλλον δὲ εἰς τὴν πλάνην αὐτῶν, ἕωσι τὰ παιδιά αὐτῶν ἀβάπτιστα καὶ συμβαίνει ἀποθνήσκειν αὐτὰ ἀφώπιστα. καὶ αὐτοὶ δὲ οἱ τὴν ἡλικίαν ἔχοντες, ἥνικα τοῦ τῆδε βίου διὰ θανάτου ἐξέρχονται, τὴν μετάληψιν τοῦ τιμίου σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ κυρίου ἀποστρέφονται. ὦ τῆς ζημίας, ὦ τῆς πλάνης καὶ τῆς ἀναισθησίας. διὸ παρακαλῶ, φεύγετε 65 ἀπὸ τῶν τοιούτων, ὅπως διὰ τοῦ φεύγειν ἡμᾶς τοὺς τοιούτους καὶ ἀποστρέφεσθαι καὶ αὐτοὶ ὅψε ποτε ἐν ἐπιγνώσει γενόμενοι εἰς μετάνοιαν ἐλεύσονται καὶ πρὸς τὴν μητέρα αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίαν ἐπιστραφήσονται.

35 δι' αὐτὸν A, B<sup>ac</sup>; διὰ τῶν B<sup>pc</sup> 37 τέχνα B 38 πάντα deest in B 40 καὶ ἔργα ἀγαθὰ διαπραττόμενοι deest in A 43 ἀποστατῶν B ad 43-44 in margine exteriore scholion add. A (fol. 25v): ὅρα πῶς παρεικάζει ὅφεις τοὺς σχηματίζοντας τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκλησίαν. 58 γαστέρα A 64 καὶ deest in A 65 ἡμᾶς τοὺς τοιούτους B: ὑμᾶς αὐτούς A 67 ἐλεύσονται...ἐπιστραφήσονται B<sup>ac</sup>A

life to those to whom the winter of trials endured here on earth for his sake brought suffering and oppression.

3. My dearly beloved children, consider then all these matters in your hearts, knowing too that it is impossible for any man who persists in his sins to be saved. Abandon your evil ways, come to church and be illumined by listening to the customary psalmody and readings and by the practice of good works. Then your consciences will not be put to shame when the time comes for the fearful judgement. Flee the serpentine counsels of evil men who are in schism from the church, for such men are clearly serpents. Under the guise of friendship and in sheepskins they are enemies and wolves. Like howling wolves they seek after food and whenever they find sheep unguarded they carry them off and rip them to pieces.<sup>1</sup> Such is the work of the deceitful men and false teachers who feign piety, disguising themselves with an outward show of poverty,<sup>2</sup> while on the inside they harbour darkling thoughts as pleasure-seekers, money-grabbers, ostentatious boasters, insult-mongers, perpetrators of fighting and contention, in sum, as men who are quite mad.<sup>3</sup> With the intention of bringing about their own desires they penetrate city and countryside, howling like wolves. They instruct the people of God to stay away from the church, to flee the sacred rites, to refuse obedience to the pastors of the churches. They introduce divisions into family homes, counselling them not even to take food and drink together.<sup>4</sup> Finally, they try to extract money from them. Whenever they manage to drag some into their diabolical way of thinking and win their allegiance, then they seize the souls of Christians and cast them into the belly of the devil. This is how they introduce divisions into the church of God. Those who are won over to their teaching, or rather, to their error, allow their children to go unbaptized and there is the possibility that these may die without the sacrament of Illumination. And the adults, even when they are on the point of leaving this life in death, reject communion in the venerable Body and Blood of the Lord. O the loss, the error, the indifference! Therefore, flee such men, I beg you, so that through our fleeing and rejecting them they too may in the end come to their senses and return in repentance to the church, their mother.

<sup>1</sup> Similar imagery is found in Methodios, *De schismate vitando* 13 (PG 140:797c).

<sup>2</sup> i.e., as monks. Theoleptos plays on the word σκήμα, outward appearance/monastic habit.

<sup>3</sup> John Cheilas resorts to similar name-calling when speaking of the Arsenites: *Against the Arsenites* 1.11 (358.17-19) and 5.11 (398.16-17).

<sup>4</sup> George Pachymeres made the same observation: 'In truth the schism in the Church at that time continued to grow to such a point that even within households families were divided, the father adopting one position and a son another, and similarly with mother and daughter, daughter-in-law and mother-in-law (4.28).'

4. Ὁ θεὸς πλάσας τὸν Ἀδὰμ ἔθετο αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ, προστάξας αὐτῷ ἀπὸ παντὸς ξύλου τοῦ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ ἐσθίειν, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ
- 70 ξύλου τοῦ γινώσκειν καλὸν καὶ πονηρὸν μὴ φαγεῖν. ὁ τοίνυν προπάτωρ, ἕως μὲν ἦν φύλαξ τῆς ἐντολῆς, ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ ἠυλίκετο, ὅτε δὲ τῇ τοῦ ὄφως συμβουλῇ ἐπέστη καὶ τοῦ ἀπηγορευμένου ξύλου μετέλαβεν, εὐθὺς ὡς παραβάτης τοῦ παραδείσου ἐκβέβληται. ἀκούων τὴν ἱστορίαν τῆς γραφῆς, κατανόει καὶ τὰ ἀγαθὰ ὧν ἡξιώθη παρὰ τοῦ σωτῆρος Χριστοῦ καὶ βλέπε
- 75 τὰ τελούμενα καθ' ἐκάστην πράγματα, ἵνα τὴν ἀκολουθίαν ὁρῶν ἀσφαλιζόμενος ἥς σεαυτὸν, ἐκκλίνων ἀπὸ κακοῦ καὶ ὅση σοι δύνამις μηχανώμενος προσμένειν ἐν τῷ καλῷ, ἵνα μὴ ἀπορραθυμήσας τὴν ἴσῃν ἢ καὶ τὴν χεῖρωνα καὶ αὐτὸς τιμωρίαν ὑπομένης.
5. Ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ υἱὸς ἄνθρωπος ἀναμαρτήτως γέγονε διὰ σε καὶ διὰ τοῦ
- 80 ἀγίου βαπτίσματος καὶ τοῦ τιμίου αἵματος ὃ ἐξέχεεν ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ ἀνέπλασέ σε, ἀπὸ ἀπιστίας καὶ πλάνης καὶ κακίας εἰς πίστιν καὶ ἀληθειαν καὶ ἀρετὴν μεταγαγὼν καὶ χειραγωγήσας σε. ὥσπερ δὲ τινα παράδεισον τὰς κατὰ τόπους φυτεύσας ἐκκλησίας, συνήγαγε πάντας ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐταῖς καὶ μίαν ἔθετο ἐκκλησίαν τῇ πίστει καὶ τῷ φρονήματι· ἐντειλάμενος ἡμῖν
- 85 ἀπὸ παντὸς ἀνθρώπου τοῦ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ σχολάζοντος καὶ τοῦ ταῖς συνάξεσι παραμένοντος καὶ τῶν θείων γραφῶν ἀκρωμένου βρῶσιν διδασκαλίας ἐσθίειν καὶ συμβουλὴν δέχεσθαι καὶ λόγους ὠφελείας ζητεῖν· ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τοῦ κακὰ μὲν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ἔχοντος, καλὰ δὲ ἐν τῷ στόματι φέροντος καὶ διχοστασίας καὶ σχίσματα προτρεπομένου διδασ-
- 90 καλίαν μὴ λαμβάνειν, μὴ ὁμιλίαν ἔχειν μετ' αὐτοῦ, μὴ φιλίαν, μὴ συγκαθεδρίαν, φεύγειν δὲ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ὡς ἀπὸ πυρός. ἡ γὰρ ὥρα ἢ συμβουλὴ αὐτῶν χώραν εὐρίσκει καὶ συμφωνίαν ἐν ταῖς ψυχαῖς, σχισματικούς εὐθὺς καὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἀποφεύγοντας ἀποτελεῖ τοὺς παραδεχομένους αὐτήν· ὁ γὰρ καρπὸς τῶν τοιούτων ἀνθρώπων τῶν συμβουλὴν μὲν ἐν τῇ γλώσσῃ φο-
- 95 ροῦντων, ἐπιβουλὴν δὲ ἐν ταῖς ψυχαῖς φερόντων, σχίσμα ἐστὶ καὶ διάστασις τοῦ σώματος τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἀποστροφή τε τῶν ἁγίων δώρων καὶ ἀθέτησις τῆς ἱερωσύνης· ὅθεν καὶ οἱ παραδεχόμενοι τὴν πλάνην αὐτῶν, γυμνούμενοι τῆς ἀληθείας, προφάσεις ἀνευλόγους καὶ ματαιολογίας καὶ συκοφαντίας κατὰ τῶν ἀγωνιστῶν τῆς εὐσεβείας συρράπτουσι καθάπερ τινὰ φύλλα
- 100 συκῆς, ματαίαις ὑποσχέσεσι καὶ κεναῖς ἐλπίσι καὶ ψευδοπροφητεῖαις πραγματευόμενοι τῆς ἐμπαθείας καὶ ἀγνωσίας αὐτῶν τὴν γύμνωσιν περικαλύπτειν. τοσοῦτον γὰρ τῆς ὁρθότητος ἐξετράπησαν οἱ στρεβλότατοι, ὡς καὶ τὰς ὑπονοίας καὶ τὰ πλάσματα τῶν λογισμῶν αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ ῥήματα,

74 ὦν B      76 σεαυτὸν: ἑαυτῶν A<sup>ac</sup>, ἑαυτὸν A<sup>ac</sup>      83 ἐκκλησίας correxi: ἐκλήσίας B:  
ἐκκλησίας A      89-90 διδασκαλίας B      96 τοῦ σώματος deest in A      98 δὲ post  
προφάσεις add. A      103 καὶ<sup>1</sup> deest in B

4. After God formed Adam he placed him in paradise and enjoined him to eat of any tree in paradise, but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil he was not to eat. So our forefather dwelt in paradise as long as he kept the commandment, but when he gave in to the counsel of the serpent and partook of the forbidden tree he was immediately exiled from paradise as a transgressor.<sup>5</sup> As you listen to the scripture account, consider also the good things of which you have been deemed worthy by Christ the Saviour. And take a look at what you do each day that you may see the result and safeguard yourself by avoiding evil, and with all your might contrive to abide in the good lest out of laziness you yield and suffer an equivalent or even worse punishment.

5. Without sin the Son of God has become man for your sake and, through holy baptism and the venerable blood which he shed upon the cross, he formed you anew, leading and guiding you from unbelief, error and evil to faith, truth and virtue. As a kind of paradise he planted churches in various places and gathered us together in them. He established a church united in faith and thought, enjoining us to eat the food of teaching, to accept counsel and to seek words of profit from any man who attends church assiduously, who is constant in his presence at the liturgical assemblies and who listens to the sacred scriptures. But as for the man who harbours evil in his heart but is elegant in speech and who advocates dissension and divisions, we are enjoined not to accept his teaching, not to hold converse with him, nor friendship, nor association, but rather to flee from him as from fire. The moment that their counsel finds a sympathetic welcome in souls, it immediately turns those who accept it into schismatics fleeing the church. For the fruit produced by such men who convey counsel on their tongues but bear treachery in their souls is separation and division in the church's body, avoidance of the holy gifts and rejection of the priesthood. Thus, those who accept their erroneous teaching strip themselves of the truth and, as though using leaves from a fig tree,<sup>6</sup> they stitch together a garment of irrational pretences, idle nonsense and slanders against the protagonists of orthodoxy. Laboriously they try to cover the nakedness of their passion and ignorance with empty promises, vain hopes and false prophecies. These utterly perverse men have gone so far astray from the right path that they hold as confessed doctrines and proclaim as prophecies the opinions and inventions of their reasonings and the fabulous statements peddled about by

<sup>5</sup> Gen 2:3.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Gen 3:7.

ἃ *γυναικάρια σεσωρευμένα* μυθεύονται, ὡς ὁμολογούμενα κατέχειν αὐτοὺς  
 105 καὶ ὡς προφητείας κηρύττειν αὐτάς, ἵνα διὰ τούτων πάντων ἐξαπατῶσι τὸν  
 τοῦ θεοῦ λαὸν καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἑαυτῶν ὄλεθρον κἀκείνους καθέλκωσι.

6. Μὴ οὖν ὁμοιωθῆτε αὐτοῖς, ἀδελφοί μου, μηδὲ πορευθῆτε ὀπίσω  
 αὐτῶν · πάσῃ δὲ σπουδῇ φεύγετε ἀπ' αὐτῶν καὶ ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμᾶς οὐ  
 μὴ καταλήψεται. μνημονεύετε τῆς ἐντολῆς · *ἀπὸ παντὸς ξύλου τοῦ ἐν τῷ*  
 110 *παραδείσῳ βρώσει φάγη*. παρὰδευσὸς ἐστίν, ὡς εἰρήκαμεν ἔμπροσθεν, ἡ  
 ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ · ξύλα δὲ οἱ ὀρθόδοξοι ποιμαίνες οἱ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ  
 θεοῦ, παρὰ ὀρθόδοξον ἱερέων χειροτονούμενοι καὶ ἐν ταῖς λαχούσαις  
 ἐκκλησίαις πεμπόμενοι καὶ τιθέμενοι ἐπὶ τῷ διδάσκειν καὶ καταρτίζειν  
 πάντα χριστιανόν. καρπὸς δὲ τούτων ἐστὶν ἡ ὀρθότης τῶν δογμάτων, τὸ  
 115 κρατύνειν τὸ εὐσεβὲς φρόνημα, ἡ τῶν ἐντολῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ διδασκαλία,  
 καὶ τὸ σπουδάζειν συμβιβάζειν καὶ ἐνοῦν τὰ μέλη τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἡγουν τοὺς  
 πιστοὺς, εἰς ἓν σῶμα τῆς ἐκκλησίας.

7. Πορευθῆτι λοιπὸν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ἣν ὁ Χριστὸς ἐφύτευσε καὶ  
 ἡὔξησε διὰ τῆς ἀρδείας τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος τοῦ κενωθέντος ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ,  
 120 ὡς καὶ τῆς οἰκουμένης περιλαβεῖν τὰ πέρατα, ἐν ᾗ καὶ ἐτέθης παρὰ τοῦ  
 σωτῆρος Χριστοῦ, καθάπερ ἄλλος Ἀδὰμ, πρὸς τὸ φρονεῖν τὰ σωτηριώδη  
 ταύτης ἐντάλματα. ὑποτάγητι τῷ δοθέντι σοι ποιμένι. οἰκειώθητι τῷ θεῷ  
 δι' αὐτοῦ. θεράπευσον Χριστὸν διὰ τῆς εἰς αὐτὸν τιμῆς · παρὰ γὰρ τοῦ  
 Χριστοῦ τοῦ πρώτου ποιμένου ἀπέσταλται καὶ ἐγκεχεῖρισται τὸ ποιμαί-  
 125 νειν, τοῦ εἰπόντος πρὸς τοὺς ἰδίους μαθητάς, *πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε*  
*πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*. ὁ τότε τὴν τοῦ ποιμαίνειν χάριν τοῖς μαθηταῖς δωρησάμενος,  
 αὐτὸς καὶ νῦν τὴν πρὸς ἐκείνους χάριν καὶ δωρεὰν δι' ἐκείνων πρὸς τοὺς  
 κατὰ καιροὺς ἀρχιερεῖς διαβιβάζων, ἀγιάζει καὶ σώζει τοὺς πιστεύοντας.  
 καὶ ὥσπερ ἡ τοῦ Χριστοῦ χάρις τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ δωρουμένη δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ πρὸς  
 130 τὸν λαὸν διαβαίνει καὶ αὐτὸν ἀγιάζει, οὕτω καὶ ὁ λαὸς τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ  
 προσπίπτων καὶ οἰκειούμενος δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ πρὸς τὸν Χριστὸν οἰκειοῦται  
 καὶ σώζεται. μεσίτης γάρ ἐστιν ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, ὑπὲρ τοῦ  
 λαοῦ δεήσεις καὶ ἰκεσίας καὶ προσευχὰς καὶ εὐχαριστίας διὰ παντὸς  
 ἀναφέρων πρὸς τὸν θεόν · ἀγρυπνῶν τε καὶ ἀγωνιῶν, θεῷ μὲν καταλλάττει  
 135 τοὺς πταίοντας, θεὸν δὲ πείθει δωρεῖσθαι τούτοις τῶν ἐμπταισμένων τὴν  
 ἄφεσιν · ἔτι τε νοθετῶν καὶ συμβουλεύων ἀνθρώπους μὲν ἐκκλίνειν ἀπὸ  
 κακοῦ, θεὸν δὲ πείθων δι' ἐντεύξεων καὶ προσευχῶν ἄνωθεν καταπέμπειν  
 αὐτοῖς ἰσχὺν πρὸς ἐργασίαν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ. *καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι πάσας*

ad 104 titulum περὶ γυναικῶν in margine superiore add. B (fol. 84r) 106 καθέλκωσι A  
 108 πάσῃ...αὐτῶν deest in A 111-112 ξύλα...θεοῦ deest in A 112 λαχούσαις B  
 113 ἐκκλησίαις πεμπόμενοι deest in A τῷ: τὸ A, B<sup>ae</sup> 119 ἀρδείας correxi: ἀρδείας  
 BA 123 τιμῆς deest in A 133 εὐχαριστίας correxi: εὐχαριστείας BA 134 κα-  
 ταλλάττει correxi: καταλάττει BA



'silly women, overwhelmed (by their sins).'<sup>7</sup> In all these ways they attempt to deceive the people of God and drag them down to their own destruction.

6. Therefore, do not become like these, my brothers, nor go after them, but rather flee from them in all earnest, and the anger of God will not lay hold of you. Remember the commandment: 'For food you may eat from any tree in paradise.'<sup>8</sup> As we have said above, paradise is the church of God and the trees are the orthodox pastors in God's church who have been ordained and sent to their appointed churches by orthodox bishops and established to teach and strengthen every Christian. The fruit they produce is correct doctrine, a firm mastery of orthodox thought, the teaching of Christ's commandments and zeal in bringing together and uniting the members of Christ, that is, the faithful, into the one body of the church.

7. Go then to the church which Christ planted and made to increase by watering it with his own blood emptied out upon the cross, so that it may encompass the ends of the world; in this church you were placed by Christ the Saviour, like another Adam, in order to give thought to its salvific commandments. Submit to your designated shepherd. Through him seek likeness to God. Serve Christ through the respect you show to him, for by Christ the first shepherd has he been sent and entrusted with the duties of a shepherd—just as Christ said to his disciples, 'Go, teach all nations.'<sup>9</sup> As he once bestowed the grace of pastoral care upon his disciples and now passes on the grace and gift to the pastors of the church and through them to bishops throughout time, so does he sanctify and save those who believe. And as the grace of Christ granted to the bishop passes on through him to the people and sanctifies them, so in offering obedience to the bishop and striving to liken themselves to him the people through him strive for likeness to Christ and find their salvation. The bishop is a mediator between God and men, always offering up to God on behalf of the people petitions, supplications, prayers and thanksgiving. By vigils and struggles he reconciles to God those who fall and persuades God to grant them forgiveness of their faults. And further, he admonishes and counsels men to turn away from evil, and he persuades God by entreaties and prayers to send down upon them from above strength for good works. 'And lo, I am with you always, to the close of the age.'<sup>10</sup> You are aware that the Lord said this to his disciples in order that, whenever a doubt comes along and sows

<sup>7</sup> 2 Tim 3:6.

<sup>8</sup> Gen 2:16.

<sup>9</sup> Mt 28:19.

<sup>10</sup> Mt 28:19.

- τὰς ἡμέρας ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος*, ἀκούεις τοῦ κυρίου εἰρηκότος καὶ  
 140 τοῦτο πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς, ἵνα, ὅταν ἀμφιβολίας λογισμὸς ἐπελθὼν κατα-  
 φρόνησιν τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ ἱερέων ὑποσπείρῃ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου, αὐτίκα τὸν  
 νοῦν ἐπιστρέφῃς πρὸς τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ὑπόσχεσιν· ἡ γὰρ τοιαύτη ἐπαγγελία  
 διαβαίνει καὶ πρὸς πάντας τοὺς τῆς τοιαύτης χάριτος ἀξιουμένους. καὶ ἵνα  
 μάθῃς ὅτι οὕτως ἔχει, ἄκουσον πάλιν αὐτοῦ τοῦ κυρίου λέγοντος πρὸς τὸν  
 145 ἴδιον πατέρα περὶ τῶν μαθητῶν· *οὐ περὶ αὐτῶν δὲ ἐρωτῶ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ*  
*περὶ τῶν πιστευσάντων διὰ τοῦ λόγου αὐτῶν εἰς ἐμέ*. ὁρᾷς πῶς ὅσα πρὸς τοὺς  
 μαθητάς εἴρηται, ταῦτα καὶ πρὸς τοὺς πιστεύοντας πάντας καὶ τὸν βίον  
 μιμουμένους τῶν μαθητῶν καὶ τὴν διακονίαν ἐκείνων πεπιστευμένους, τῶν  
 μαθητῶν δηλονότι, ἀναμφιβόλως διαβαίνει;
- 150 8. Αἰδέσθητι τοίνυν τὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ χειροτονίαν. σεβάσθητι τὴν αὐτοῦ  
 ἀποστολήν. εἰ προσέλθῃς ὀρθοδόξῳ ἱερεὶ καὶ δεκτῷ παρὰ τοῦ ἰδίου  
 ποιμένου, Χριστῷ προσήλθεις, Χριστὸν ἐτίμησας, Χριστὸν ἐδέξω, Χριστὸν  
 δὲ δεξάμενος, δι' αὐτοῦ ἐδέξω καὶ τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. ὁ  
 γὰρ *δεχόμενος ὑμᾶς ἐμέ δέχεται· ὁ δὲ δεχόμενος ἐμέ, δέχεται τὸν ἀποστείλαντά*  
 155 *με*, ἐξ οὗ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκπορεύεται καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἀχώριστον διαμένει.  
 εἰ καταφρονήσεις ἱερέως, εἰ ἀποστραφῇς ἱερέα, εἰ ἀτιμάσεις ἱερέα,  
 Χριστὸν ἐξουθένησας· *οὐ σέ, φησὶν, ἐξουθένησαν, ἀλλ' ἐμέ, εἴρηκε πρὸς*  
*Σαμουὴλ ὁ θεός*. ἔχεις δισταγμὸν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου, πρόσσελθε τῷ δοθέντι σοι  
 ποιμένι. μετὰ πληροφορίας πίστευσον ὅτι δι' αὐτοῦ ὁ θεὸς λαλεῖ σοι.  
 160 ἅπλωσον τὴν καρδίαν σου, ἐρώτησον αὐτόν· *ἐπερώτησον*, γάρ φησι, *τὸν*  
*πατέρα σου καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ σοι, τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους σου καὶ ἐροῦσί σοι*. ζήτησον  
 τὸν ἀρχιερέα σου καὶ δώσει σοι. πρόσσελθε τοῖς ἱερεῦσι καὶ εὐρήσεις  
 ὠφέλειαν.

9. Εἰ μὴ σὺ τὴν ταῦλαν τῆς ψυχῆς σου καθαρῇσεις, οὐ δύναται ὁ  
 165 διδάσκαλός σου ἀπόδειξιν ὀρθὴν γράψαι σοι. εἰ μὴ ἐκβάλῃς πᾶν ἄδι-  
 καίωμα καὶ πρόφασιν καὶ ἀνθρωπίνην αἰσχύνην καὶ φιλονικίαν ἀπὸ τῆς  
 καρδίας σου, οὐ δυνήσῃ δικαιοσύνην καὶ ἀλήθειαν καὶ εὐπείθειαν γνῶναι.  
 ποία γὰρ κοινωνία δικαιοσύνης πρὸς ἀδικίαν, εὐθύτητι πρὸς πονηρίαν,  
 πραότητα πρὸς ἀλαζονείαν καὶ γνώσει θεοῦ πρὸς ἀνθρωπίνην ὑπόληψιν;  
 170 πεινᾷς λόγον θεοῦ; διψᾷς μετάληψιν ἁγιασμοῦ; δράμε πρὸς τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ  
 οἶκον. φάγε τὴν ψαλμωδίαν ὡς βρῶμα. πίε τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν ὡς πόμα.  
 ἄντλησον ἐκ τῶν πηγῶν τοῦ σωτηρίου, τουτέστι, πληρώθητι τὴν ψυχὴν ἐκ  
 τῶν εὐαγγελίων τοῦ σωτῆρος· πλήρωμα γὰρ νόμου καὶ προφητῶν ὁ  
 Χριστός, καὶ *οὐκ ἤλθον καταλῦσαι, φησί, τὸν νόμον ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι*· πηγαὶ

141 ὑποσπείρει B, A<sup>ac</sup> 145 πατέραν A 148-149 τῶν μαθητῶν δηλονότι deest in A  
 152 πρόσσελθε B 153 δὲ deest in A 154 δὲ deest in A ad 155 scholion in  
 margine exteriore add. A (fol. 29v): ση(μειώσαι) — περὶ τῆς ἐκπορεύσεως τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύμα-  
 τος 156 ἀποστραφείς A 164 αὔλαν A<sup>ac</sup>, ναῦλαν A<sup>pc</sup> 165-166 ἀδικαίωμα  
 conieci: δικαίωμα BA 167 ἀπείθειαν B 174 τὸν νόμον φησὶν A

disregard for the ministers of God in your heart, you may turn your mind straightaway to the Lord's promise, for such a promise applies to all those deemed worthy of such grace. That you may learn that this is true, listen once again to the Lord's words to his Father concerning his disciples. 'I do not pray for them only, but also for those who believe in me through their word.'<sup>11</sup> Do you see how what was said to the disciples certainly applies also to all those who believe and who imitate the life of the disciples and who have been entrusted with their work of ministry (namely, that of the disciples)?

8. Therefore, respect Christ's institution of ordination. Revere the apostolic mission he established. If you approach an orthodox priest recognized by his pastor, you have approached Christ, you have honoured Christ, you have accepted Christ, and, in accepting Christ, through him you have accepted also the Father and the Holy Spirit. For 'he who receives you receives me, and he who receives me receives him who sent me',<sup>12</sup> from whom proceeds the Holy Spirit and who remains inseparable from the Son. If you show disregard for a priest, if you should repudiate a priest, if you show disrespect for a priest, you despise Christ. 'They despised not you, but me,' God said to Samuel.<sup>13</sup> You have doubt in your heart, go to your given pastor. Believe with full assurance that through him God is speaking to you. Open up your heart. Ask him your questions. For scripture says, 'Ask your father, and he will show you; your elders, and they will tell you.'<sup>14</sup> Seek out your bishop and he will grant your requests. Approach your priests and you will find profit.

9. If you will not wipe clean the tablet of your soul, your teacher cannot write out a correct exercise for you. If you do not cast out from your heart all unrighteousness, pretence, human shame and contentiousness, you will not be able to know righteousness, truth and ready obedience. For what has righteousness to do with wrongdoing, uprightness with evil, gentleness with arrogance and knowledge of God with human opinion? Do you hunger for the word of God? Do you thirst for communion in the sacrament? Run to the house of God. Partake of psalmody as food. Imbibe the readings as drink. Draw from the wellsprings of salvation, that is, fill your soul from the Gospels of the Saviour. For Christ is the fulfilment of the Law and the Prophets, and he says, 'I have come not to abolish the Law but to fulfil it.'<sup>15</sup> The four Gospels of Christ are truly wellsprings, watering

<sup>11</sup> Jn 17:20.

<sup>12</sup> Mt 10:40.

<sup>13</sup> 1 Reg 8:7.

<sup>14</sup> Deut 32:7.

<sup>15</sup> Mt 5:17.

- 175 γὰρ ἀληθῶς τὰ τέσσαρα εὐαγγέλια τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὴν τῇ δίψει τῆς ἀπιστίας  
 συνεχομένην τετραπέρατον κτίσιν τὴν θεογνωσίαν ποτίσαντα. *υἱέ, πῖνε  
 ὕδατα ἀπὸ σῶν ἀγγείων καὶ ἀπὸ σῶν φρεάτων πηγῆς*, ἡ σοφία διακελεύεταιί  
 σοι. ἀγγεῖά εἰσιν οἱ εὐσεβεῖς ποιμένες, σὰ δὲ ἀγγεῖα οὗτοι ὀνομάζονται, ὥς  
 διὰ σέ παρὰ θεοῦ τὴν τοῦ ποιμαίνειν χάριν λαμβάνοντες · ὁ ποιμὴν γὰρ διὰ  
 180 τοὺς ποιμαινομένους ἔστι τε καὶ λέγεται. βουλόμενος γὰρ ὁ θεὸς εἰς  
 ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἔρχεσθαι τὸν λαὸν καὶ τὸ νᾶμα τῆς σωτηρίας ποτίζεσ-  
 θαι, ὥς ἀγγεῖά τινα καὶ σκεύη τοὺς κατὰ καιροὺς ποιμένας καὶ ἱερεῖς  
 εὐσεβῶς ἐκλεγόμενος καὶ καταρτίζων, ἐμβάλλει τὴν χάριν αὐτοῦ καὶ  
 δωρεὰν ἐν αὐτοῖς · καὶ διὰ τῆς λειτουργίας καὶ διδασκαλίας αὐτῶν παντὶ  
 185 τῷ λαῷ βραβεύει τὴν γνώσιν τῶν αὐτοῦ θελημάτων.
10. Προσερχόμενος οὖν, υἱέ, τῷ ποιμένι σου, πῖνε ἀπὸ τοῦ στόματος  
 αὐτοῦ τὸν σωτηριῶδη λόγον καὶ μὴ διὰ τὴν σπαρεῖσαν ἐν σοὶ κατ' αὐτοῦ  
 πονηρὰν ὑπόνοιαν παρὰ τοῦ ἐχθροῦ ἢ παρὰ τῶν κακῶν ἀνθρώπων παραι-  
 τήσῃ τὴν διδασκαλίαν αὐτοῦ · ἀλλὰ μηδὲ διὰ τὸν κατεγνωσμένον βίον  
 190 αὐτοῦ, εἰ καὶ τύχῃ ἀδιάφορος εἶναι, ἀποστραφῆς τὴν ἀγαθὴν παραινεῖσιν  
 αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν δι' αὐτοῦ σοι χορηγούμενον ἁγιασμόν. φησὶ γὰρ ὁ κύριος,  
*ἐπὶ τῆς Μωσέως καθέδρας ἐκάθισαν οἱ ἱερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς. πάντα οὖν ὅσα  
 ἂν λέγωνιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἱερεῖς ποιεῖν ποιεῖτε, κατὰ δὲ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν μὴ ποιεῖτε ·*  
*λέγουσι γὰρ καὶ οὐ ποιοῦσιν.* ὁρᾷς πῶς οὐκ ἀποστρέφεται προσητάγμεθα τὴν  
 195 διδασκαλίαν τῶν εὐσεβῶν ποιμένων διὰ τὸν ἀμελῆ βίον αὐτῶν; δεῖ οὖν τὸν  
 βουλόμενον σωθῆναι τῶν μὲν σεμνὸν βίον ἐπιδεικνυμένων-ἱερέων σκοπεῖν  
 καὶ τὸν λόγον καὶ τὸν τρόπον, ὥς ἀμφοτέρωθεν ὠφελεῖσθαι δυνάμενον ·  
 τῶν δὲ τρόπον μὲν ἐχόντων ἀδιάφορον, λόγον δὲ ὠφέλιμον καὶ σωτηρίας  
 πρόξενον τὸν λόγον μόνον ὁρᾷν καὶ καρποῦσθαι. ὥσπερ γὰρ ὁ ἀγαθὰ  
 200 ἐργαζόμενος διὰ τοῦ βίου αὐτοῦ ὠφελεῖ τοὺς ὀρῶντας καὶ μὴ διδάσκων,  
 οὕτω καὶ ὁ ἀγαθὰ παραινῶν καὶ συμβουλευὼν διὰ τοῦ λόγου αὐτοῦ ὠφελεῖ  
 τοὺς θέλοντας ὠφελῆσθαι, εἰ καὶ ὁ διδάσκων ἀμελῶς ἀναστρέφεται.
11. Εἶδον αἶραν μετὰ τοῦ σίτου καὶ οὐκ ἀπεστράφην τὸν σῖτον διὰ τὴν  
 αἶραν, ἀλλὰ τῆς αἶρας ἀμελήσας, οὐκ ἀπραγμάτευτος ἔμεινα · ἐσκεπάμην  
 205 γὰρ ὅτι ὁ μύλων τὸν σῖτον δεχόμενος καὶ τὴν προσοῦσαν αὐτῷ αἶραν ἀντὶ  
 σίτου ἀλήθει, ἥτις καὶ τῷ ὑπερβάλλοντι φυράματι τῆς σιτίνης ἀλεύρου  
 ἀναχεομένη καὶ καταπονουμένη εἰς ἄρτου τροφὴν γίνεται καὶ *ἡ καρδία τοῦ  
 ἀνθρώπου τῇ βρώσει στηρίζεται.* τοιοῦτόν τι προσήκει ποιεῖν καὶ τοῖς προαι-

ad 180-181 in margine exteriore scholion add. B (fol. 86v): ὅτι δεῖ καὶ παρ' ὧν ὁ βίος  
 οὐκ ἀγαθοῖς ἤπερ ἀληθεῖ διδάσκουσιν ἀκούειν προσεχῶς τὰ λεγόμενα καὶ ποιεῖν αὐτά  
 183 ἐκβάλλει B 185 τῷ deest in A ad 187-188 in margine exteriore scholion alia  
 manu add. B (fol. 87r): ὥς ἡ Εὔα τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ, διὰ τὴν τοῦ ὄψεως συμβουλὴν  
 189 μηδὲ deest in A 190 τύχης διάφορος A 203 εἶδον coniecti: οἶδα BA  
 205 ὁ deest in B 206 τῷ: τὸ B 207 ἀνερχομένη A

with the knowledge of God the four bounds of creation held in the thirst of unbelief. 'My son,' Wisdom commands you, 'drink water from your reservoirs and from your spring-fed wells.'<sup>16</sup> The orthodox pastors are the reservoirs, and these are called your reservoirs because they receive the grace of pastoral care from God for your sake. For the pastor is so named because his office exists for the sake of those under his pastoral care. Wishing the people to come to a realization of the truth and to be watered by the streams of salvation, God chooses and prepares as reservoirs and vessels in their various times orthodox pastors and priests and fills them with his grace and gift. And through their ministry and teaching he rewards all the people with the knowledge of his will.

**10.** Go then, my son, to your pastor, imbibe the salvific word from his mouth and do not deprecate his teaching for the sake of an evil suspicion about him sown within you by the enemy or by evil men. Nor should you reject his good advice and the means of sanctification he provides for your benefit because of accusations made against his manner of life, even though this may in fact be mediocre. For the Lord says, 'The priests and scribes sit on Moses' seat; so practise whatever the priests tell you, but not what they do; for they preach but do not practise.'<sup>17</sup> Do you see how we have been commanded not to repudiate the teaching of orthodox pastors because of laxity of conduct on their part? The man who wishes to be saved must therefore consider both the words and the conduct of those priests who exhibit a holy life since he can derive profit from both, but, as for those priests whose conduct is mediocre while their words offer profit and salvation, he must observe and derive fruit from their words alone. For just as the man who produces good works in his life benefits those who look to him, even though he does not teach, so also the man who offers good advice and counsel through his words offers benefits to those willing to receive them, even though the teacher is negligent in his conduct.

**11.** I have seen darnel mixed in with the wheat and I did not reject the wheat because of the darnel. Rather, neglecting the darnel, I was not without recourse, for I considered that when the miller accepts wheat he grinds, not pure wheat, but even the darnel that goes with it, and when the darnel is poured into and kneaded with the far greater dough of wheat-meal it becomes nourishing bread, and 'the heart of man is strengthened with food.'<sup>18</sup> This is what those who have chosen to derive profit from all things should do. If by chance you notice someone who is negligent in his conduct but offers helpful and beneficial advice to his neighbours, or someone who possesses good works but as a human being shows certain faults,

<sup>16</sup> Prov 5:15.

<sup>17</sup> Mt 23:2-3. This text is also cited by John Cheilas, *Against the Arsenites* 4.1 (377.22-24).

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Ps 103:15.

ρουμένοις ἐκ πάντων ὠφελεῖσθαι. εἴ που καὶ γάρ τινα θεάσεται τις ἀμελῶς  
 210 μὲν περὶ τὸν βίον διακείμενον, λυσιτελῇ δὲ καὶ ὠφέλιμα τοῖς πλησίον  
 παραινούντα, ἢ πολλὰς μὲν ἀγαθὰς πράξεις ἔχοντα, ὡς ἄνθρωπον δὲ ὅμως  
 καὶ τινα ἐλαττώματα ἐπιφερόμενον, οὐκ ὀφείλει τὰ πολλὰ κατορθώματα  
 παρατρέχειν, τοῖς δὲ ὀλίγοις ἐλαττώμασιν ὀφθαλμῷ πονηρῷ ἐπιβάλλειν  
 215 λεσθαι. χρῆ δὲ μᾶλλον διὰ τῶν κατορθωμάτων ἀποκρούεσθαι τὰ ἐλαττώ-  
 ματα καὶ διὰ τοῦ ἐνὸς καλοῦ τὸ ἕτερον κακὸν ἀποστρέφεσθαι καὶ τὴν  
 ἀποστολικὴν ἐντεῦθεν παραινέσιν διαφυλάττειν, ἥνικα διακελεύουσιν ἐν  
 τῷ ἀγαθῷ τὸ κακόν.

12. Ὁ γὰρ βάσκανος δαίμων ὁ τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ φθονῶν σωτηρίᾳ, ταῖς  
 220 αἰσθήσεσιν ἡμῶν ἐπικαθεζόμενος, αἰεὶ ποτε πειράται οὐκ εἰς τὰ ἐλαττώ-  
 ματα μόνον τοῦ πλησίον παραπέμπει τὸν νοῦν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἀλλ' ἤδη  
 καὶ τὰ προτερήματα αὐτοῦ διαβάλλεσθαι ποιεῖν, πανταχόθεν ἐπειγόμενος  
 πονηρᾶς ὑπολήψεις ἐμβάλλειν ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ πρὸς τὸ πάντων καταγινώσκειν·  
 καὶ οὕτω διακωλύει ὁ πονηρὸς τὴν ἀπὸ πάντων ὠφέλειαν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.  
 225 ποιεῖ γὰρ ἕκαστον τὸν τῷ τοιούτῳ ἀλισκόμενον πάθει ἑαυτὸν μόνον  
 ἐνάρετον καὶ σύνετον ἡγεῖσθαι, πάντας δὲ ἀνθρώπους ἀμαρτωλοὺς καὶ  
 ἀσυνέτους ἔχειν. ἐν τῷ τοιούτῳ ἀνθρώπῳ ἢ κατὰ πάντων κατάγνωσις  
 κατακρατεῖ, ἥτις καὶ τῆς καρδίας ἐν ἧ φωλεῦει αὕτη κατακυριεύουσα οὐκ  
 ἀφίησι τὸν ὑπ' αὐτῆς δυναστευόμενον ἄνθρωπον παρ' ἄλλου ποτὲ διδα-  
 230 χθῆναι καὶ τὰ ἐκείνου ἐνωτίσασθαι ῥήματα· θυγάτηρ γὰρ οὕσα τῆς  
 κακίστης ὑπερηφανίας, καὶ τὰ δίκαια τῆς κληρονομίας ταύτης ἀποφέρε-  
 ται. γνῶρισμα γὰρ ὑπερηφανίας τὸ ἀποκλείειν τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς ὥτα, καθάπερ  
 τις ἀσπίς, καὶ μὴ καταδέχεσθαι μαθητευθῆναι τι τὸ παράπαν καὶ ὑπο-  
 ταγῆναι.

235 13. Κύριε, ῥῦσαι τὰς ψυχὰς ἡμῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ὀλεθρίου ταύτης ἀρρωστίας  
 καὶ δώρησαι ἡμῖν καρδίαν ταπεινὴν καὶ λογισμὸν συντετριμμένον καὶ  
 διανάστησον ἐμέ τε καὶ τὸν λαόν σου εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ σωτηρίου καὶ  
 ἐνδόξου σου θελήματος· σὺ γὰρ εἶ ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός, ὁ ποιμένας καὶ  
 ποίμνια ποιμαίνων, καὶ ἐξάγων ἀπὸ κακίας καὶ εἰσάγων πρὸς ἀρετὴν, ἀπὸ  
 240 σκότους τε πρὸς φῶς καὶ ἐκ θανάτου πρὸς ζωὴν καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπιγείων πρὸς  
 τὰ οὐράνια διαβιβάζων. καὶ σοὶ πρέπει δόξα, τιμὴ καὶ προσκύνησις εἰς τοὺς  
 αἰῶνας. Ἀμήν.

214-215 καὶ διὰ...ἀποβάλλεσθαι deest in A  
 225 καὶ post ποιεῖ add. B τῷ deest in A

222 ἐπειγόμενος correxi: ἐπιγόμενος BA

there is no profit in disregarding his numerous good qualities and maliciously focusing attention on his few faults, thereby rejecting even what is valuable because of matters that deserve to be overlooked. Rather, one should discard the faults for the sake of the good qualities and for the one good reject the other evil and thus keep the apostolic counsel 'to overcome evil with good.'<sup>19</sup>

12. The jealous demon who envies us our salvation installs himself in our senses and ever tries to direct a man's mind to focus not only on his neighbour's faults but even to slander his superior qualities as well. In every way he hastens to introduce in our soul evil suspicions so that we condemn everyone. And thus the evil one hinders man's ability to derive profit from all circumstances, for he makes each man captured by such a passion think that he alone possesses virtue and understanding, while all other men are sinners and fools. In such a man there reigns a general condemnation of others. Because this contempt dominates the heart in which it lurks, it does not allow the man it rules ever to be taught by someone else or give heed to what he says. As the daughter of the very worst sort of arrogance this sort of condemnatory attitude carries away with it the rights of this inheritance. One sign of such arrogance is the stoppage of the ears of the soul, like the [deaf] asp [of the Psalm],<sup>20</sup> or its refusal to be taught by or be subject to anyone at all.

13. O Lord save our souls from this mortal illness and grant us a humble heart and contrite thoughts.<sup>21</sup> Raise me up together with your people to an understanding of your saving and glorious will. For you are the good shepherd who care for shepherds and sheep, who lead forth from evil and guide towards virtue, who grant passage from darkness to light and from earthly to heavenly realities. To you be glory, honour and worship forever. Amen.

<sup>19</sup> Rom 12:2.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Ps 57:5-6.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Ps 50:19.

## PD 2

Λόγος λαληθείς πρὸς τὸ κατὰ τὴν Φιλαδελφεῖαν χριστιανικώτατον πλήρωμα, ἐπαινῶν καὶ ἀποδεχόμενος τοὺς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ σχολάζοντας καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν γραφῶν ἀκούοντας καὶ μετὰ φόβου τοῖς θείοις μυστηρίοις προσερχομένους, ἐλέγχων δὲ ἅμα καὶ παρακαλῶν πρὸς ἐπιστροφὴν τοὺς  
5 ἀποστρεφόμενους τὴν κοινωνίαν τῶν ὁρθοδόξων χριστιανῶν καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας χωριζομένους

1. Δαβὶδ ὁ μακάριος ἐπὶ τοῖς εἰρηκόσιν αὐτῷ, εἰς οἶκον κυρίου πορευσόμεθα, εὐφροσύνης πεπλήρωται. κἀγὼ σήμερον, ἀκούων τὰς συνεχεῖς ὑμῶν διατριβάς τὰς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ γενομένας, χαίρω καὶ εὐφραίνομαι  
10 καὶ τῆς δαβιτικῆς εὐφροσύνης τὴν διάθεσιν ἐν αἰσθήσει δέχομαι. τάχα δέ, εἰ καὶ τολμηρὸν εἰπεῖν, καὶ πλέον ἐνταῦθα ὑπὸ τῆς πνευματικῆς ἡδονῆς συλλαμβάνεται ὁ φιλόκαλος ἀνὴρ καὶ τῆς πίστεως γνήσιος ἑραστής καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀγαπῶν τὴν εὐπρέπειαν, ἐπειδὴ καὶ μεῖζον ὧδε τὸ τῆς εὐφροσύνης ὑπέκκαυμα ἀναφαίνεται. ἐκεῖ μὲν γὰρ οἱ τὸν προφήτην  
15 ἐρωτήσαντες ῥήματα μόνα τῆς πρὸς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπαγωγῆς εἰς τὰ ῥα αὐτοῦ κατέβαλλον· ἐνταῦθα δὲ διὰ ῥημάτων οἱ ἐπιδημοῦντες ἐνθάδε τὰς ἐν τοῖς οἴκοις τοῦ θεοῦ πανδήμους συνάξεις καὶ πυκνὰς συνελεύσεις ὑμῶν εἰς τὰς ἑμᾶς ἀκοὰς ἐνηχοῦσιν. εἰ γὰρ συμβουλὴ μόνη τοῦ πρὸς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ πορευθῆναι εἰς εὐφροσύνην τὸν προφήτην ἐκίνησε, τὴν  
20 φιλόθεον διάθεσιν τῶν εἰρηκότων ἐννοήσαντα, πῶς οὐχὶ καὶ αὐτὸς ἀγαλλιάσομαι ἐπὶ ταῖς φιλοχρίστοις ὑμῶν διαθέσει ταῖς φανερουμέναις ἐκ τοῦ συνεχῶς ἐπιχωριάζειν ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις καὶ προσεδρεύειν τῷ κυρίῳ διὰ τῶν ἐν αὐταῖς τελουμένων ψαλμωδιῶν, ἔργοις αὐτοῖς παριστώσας τὴν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἀγάπην διάπυρον τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν; καὶ τί λέγω ὅτι συμ-  
25 βουλή ἦσαν ἐκεῖνα τὰ ῥήματα ἃ ὁ προφήτης ἀκήκοεν; ἀληθῶς γὰρ συμβουλευτικῶς οἱ εἰρηκότες ἐλάλησαν, ὁμοῦ τὰς ἑαυτῶν φιλοθέους διανοίας δεικνύοντες καὶ τὰς τῷ θεῷ πόθῳ τετρωμένας ψυχὰς πρὸς τὸν ὅμοιον ἐφελκόμενοι ἔρωτα. ἀλλ' ὁ προφήτης, εἰώθως βλέπειν τὰ ἔμπροσθεν, τὰς ἀνεγειρομένας ἐκκλησίας παρὰ τῶν φιλοχρίστων ἀνδρῶν τῷ πνεύματι  
30 ἐπιγνοῦς, καὶ τὴν ἐν τοῖς λόγοις ἐκείνων τυπουμένην φιλόθεον γνῶσιν διὰ τῶν ἔργων ἐκβαινομένην ὕστερον ἐν τοῖς χριστιανοῖς καταμαθῶν, καὶ τὰ πλήθη τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν καὶ τὰς ἀγέλας τῶν εὐσεβῶν θεωρήσας συρρεοῦσας καὶ ἀποτρεχοῦσας πρὸς τοὺς θείους οἴκους, εἰς κόλπους τῆς θείας εὐφροσύνης εἰσέδου καὶ εἰς ἀγκάλας τῆς πνευματικῆς ἡδονῆς ἀνεκλήθη.

1 Φιλαδελφεῖαν A

14 ὑπέκαυμα B, A<sup>pc</sup>

ἐκείνων: ἐπιλόγοις ἐκείνην A

5 τῆς: τοὺς A

24 τὸν deest in A

32-33 συρρεοῦσας καὶ ἀποτρεχοῦσας deest in A

10 δαυιτικῆς B

28 βλέπει A

11 εἰ καί: ἢ A

30 ἐν τοῖς λόγοις



**Discourse pronounced before the most Christian community of Philadelphia: here praise and acknowledgement is given to those who frequent the church, listen to the sacred scriptures and approach with reverence the divine mysteries; here, at the same time, reproof and exhortation to conversion is given to those who have rejected communion with orthodox Christians and have separated themselves from the church**

1. Blessed David was filled with joy over those who had said to him, 'We shall go to the house of the Lord.'<sup>1</sup> And today I too rejoice and am glad and feel the emotion of David's joy, when I hear of your assiduous attendance in God's church. But perhaps, though it be bold to say so, the man devoted to the beauty of the ascetic life, who is a true lover of the faith and who loves the comeliness of the church, is under these circumstances carried away more by spiritual pleasure than by any other, since here the fuel of joy is even more apparent. For in that case the people who loved the prophet were shouting in his ears only the words of the procession to the house of God, but in this case the local inhabitants have through their words made the news of your public liturgical assemblies and large gatherings in the houses of God resound in my hearing. If a mere counsel to proceed to the house of God moved the prophet to joy when he considered the God-loving disposition of those who had offered it, how shall I too not find joy in your Christ-loving dispositions evident from your custom of frequent attendance in the churches and your recourse to the Lord through the psalmody offered there—dispositions which by actual deeds portray the fervent love of God in your souls? And why do I say that the words the prophet had heard were a counsel? For surely those who spoke these words offered them as a counsel, at the same time manifesting their own God-loving attitudes while drawing their souls, wounded by Godly desire, towards a like love. But when the prophet, accustomed to seeing future events, recognized in the Spirit the churches that would be erected by Christ-loving men, and perceived the God-loving knowledge impressed upon their words and later expressed in deeds among Christians, and considered the multitude of churches and the flocks of pious people coming together and going off to the houses of God, he entered into the bosom of divine joy and was summoned to the embrace of spiritual pleasure.

<sup>1</sup> Ps 121:1.

- 35 2. Τοιγαροῦν καὶ αὐτὸς τὴν σήμερον διδασκόμενος τὴν ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις σχολὴν ὑμῶν καὶ προσεδρεῖαν καὶ ἀναζωγραφῶν ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ τὸ πέλαγος τοῦ πλήθους ὑμῶν, τὴν μετὰ τοῦ θείου φόβου παράστασιν καὶ τὴν μετὰ προθυμίας ἀκρόασιν, ἀγαλλιώμαι τῇ ψυχῇ καὶ ὡς παροῦσιν ὑμῖν τὸν νόμον ἀποπληρῶ τῆς ἀγάπης. ἐκ γὰρ τῆς περὶ ὑμῶν ἀγαθῆς ἀκοῆς
- 40 ταύτης ἔπεισέ μοι νοεῖν τὸ φιλόθεον τῶν ὑμετέρων ψυχῶν, τῆς διανοίας ὑμῶν τὸ ὀρθόδοξον καὶ πρὸς τὰ θεῖα δόγματα εὐπειθές. στοχάζομαι τὸ πρὸς τοὺς διαβάλλοντας τὴν ἀλήθειαν καὶ πειρωμένους τὰ ὀρθὰ φρονήματα τῶν ἀνθρώπων διαστρέφειν μῖσος ὑμῶν. διαγινώσκω τὸ φιλάδελφον καὶ τὸ πρὸς ἀλλήλους περὶ τὰ καλὰ ὁμονοητικόν. ἐννοῶ τὴν πρὸς τοὺς
- 45 σχιζομένους τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐλεεινῶς καὶ ὡς σεσηπότα μέλη ἀναισθητῶς ἐκ ταύτης ἑαυτοὺς ἀποκόπτοντας ἀποστροφῇ ὑμῶν. διδάσκομαι τὸν πόθον ὑμῶν, ὃν τρέφετε περὶ τὴν ζήτησιν τῆς ἀκριβοῦς πολιτείας καὶ τοῦ καθαροῦ βίου· τούτων γὰρ τῶν ἀγαθῶν πάντων διδάσκαλος ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκλησία πέφυκε καὶ ταῦτα οἶδε παρέχειν αὕτῃ τοῖς γνησίως καὶ διόλου
- 50 πρὸς αὐτὴν ἐρχομένοις.
3. Καὶ καθάπερ μητὴρ ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων μαζῶν προχέει γάλα τοῖς στόμασι τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς, οὕτω καὶ ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκλησία τοῖς πορευομένοις εἰς αὐτὴν καὶ προσκαρτεροῦσιν ἐν αὐτῇ καὶ μετὰ προσοχῆς ἵσταμένοις καὶ μετὰ προθυμίας ἀκρωμένοις καὶ ἐν τῇ μελέτῃ τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ διδασκομένων
- 55 ἀγαθῶν διηνεκῶς ἀνακλινομένοις ὀρθότητα δογμάτων καὶ βίου καθαρότητα, ὡς δύο τινὰς μαστοὺς βραβεύουσα, προτίθησιν ἐνώπιον τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν. οἱ δὲ τὰς ψυχὰς φωτιζόμενοι διὰ τῶν τῆς πίστεως λόγων καὶ τὰ σώματα καθαιρόμενοι διὰ τῶν τῆς ἀρετῆς τρόπων καὶ τῆς ἀγαθῆς πολιτείας χαρὰς ἀρρήτου ἐπαπολαύουσι, χορταζόμενοι τὴν συνείδησιν
- 60 ἀποπληροφoρίας τῆς ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίας. καὶ ἵνα μάθῃς ὅτι αἱ ψυχαὶ τῶν τοιούτων ἀνθρώπων τῶν πυκνῶς διατριβόντων ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις κορέννυνται ἐν τῇ πληροφορίᾳ τῆς σωτηρίας καὶ τῇ ἐλπίδι τῆς θείας ζωῆς, ἄκουε τοῦ κυρίου λέγοντος· *οὐκ ἐπ' ἄρτῳ μόνῳ ζήσεται ἄνθρωπος, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ παντὶ ῥήματι ἐκπορευομένῳ διὰ στόματος θεοῦ*. ἄκουε δὲ καὶ τοῦ προφήτου Δαβὶδ,
- 65 *ἐγὼ δὲ ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ ὀφθῆσομαι τῷ προσώπῳ σου, χορτασθήσομαι ἐν τῷ ὀφθῆναι μοι τὴν δόξαν σου*. ἀκολουθοῦν δὲ εἰπεῖν· ἐγὼ δὲ ἐν ἐκκλησίαις ὀφθῆσομαι εὐλογῶν τὸ πρόσωπόν σου, χορτασθήσομαι ἐν τῷ μετέχειν με τῶν ὀφθάντων σου μυστηρίων. ποῦ γὰρ ἀλλαχοῦ πηγάζουσι τὰ ῥήματα ζωῆς τῆς αἰωνίου καὶ οἱ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγοι τρανῶς ἀνακηρύττονται, εἰ μὴ ἐν
- 70 τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ; ἐξ ἧς καὶ ἀντλοῦντες οἱ πιστοὶ νοήματα σωτηρίας ὡς νάματα καθαρὰ, οὐκέτι διψῶσι, τὸν πόθον τῆς πρὸς αὐτὴν σχολῆς ἐνστερνιζόμενοι καὶ τὴν ἔνωσιν αὐτῆς ἀσφαλῶς κρατοῦντες, καὶ τῷ γάλακτι τῶν ψαλμωδιῶν καὶ τῶν ἀναγνώσεων τῶν ἐν ταῖς κοιναῖς συνάξεσιν ἐπιτελουμένων ἀρκοῦμενοι καὶ διακρατούμενοι. ὅθεν καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς τοιαύτης

2. Therefore, in learning today of your frequent and assiduous attendance in the churches, picturing in my mind the vast sea of your numbers, your presence, which displays the fear of God, and your eager attentiveness, I too am glad in soul and I fulfil the law of love as though in your presence.<sup>2</sup> As a result of hearing this good report concerning you, my thoughts are turned towards the God-loving disposition of your souls, the orthodoxy of your understanding and your obedience in regard to the sacred dogmas. I divine your hatred for those who slander the truth and attempt to divert men from the right way of thinking. I recognize your fraternal charity and your mutual agreement regarding what is good. I bear in mind the way you separate yourselves from those who pitifully break away from the church and without feeling cut themselves off from it like gangrenous members. I am informed of the desire you nurture for seeking a genuinely virtuous conduct and a pure life, for the church of God is the master of all these good things and knows how to provide for those who come to her in sincerity and constancy

3. Just as a mother pours milk from her breasts into the mouths of her children, so too does the church of God set orthodoxy of doctrine and purity of life before the eyes of those who approach her and persevere in her and who are steadfastly attentive and eager to listen and who ever set themselves to meditate on the good things taught there; these two gifts she awards as her two breasts. Those with their souls illumined by the words of faith and their bodies purified by the way of virtue and good conduct experience joy, feasting on the fully conscious assurance of their own salvation. And that you may learn that the souls of such men who are assiduous in their church attendance receive full assurance of salvation and hope for divine life, listen to the Lord who says, 'Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceeds from the mouth of God.'<sup>3</sup> Listen also to the prophet David, 'As for me, I shall behold your face in righteousness; I shall be satisfied with beholding your glory.'<sup>4</sup> Accordingly, I can say: 'I shall behold your face as I offer praise in the churches; I shall be satisfied when I partake of your immaculate mysteries.' For where else do the words of eternal life have their source and where else are God's proclamations clearly announced but in the church of God? There, the faithful draw thoughts of salvation as from pure streams of running water and thirst no more, since they embrace a desire for church attendance, hold securely to union with her, find their satisfaction in and hold to themselves the milk of the psalmody and the readings that are held in the public liturgical assemblies. Thus, because of such study and diligence they yield not the slightest to the

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Rom 13:10.

<sup>3</sup> Deut 8:3, Mt 4:4, Lk 4:4.

<sup>4</sup> Ps 16:15.

- 75 μελέτης τε καὶ σπουδῆς μηδόλως συγχωρούμενοι πρὸς τὴν θολερὰν καὶ  
 δολερὰν καὶ ἄτοπον διδασκαλίαν δραμεῖν τῶν ἀποστατῶν καὶ σπαρακτῶν  
 τῆς ἐκκλησίας, οὐ διαλύονται, οὐδὲ διαχέονται ἐν τῇ πλάνῃ τῶν διεστραμ-  
 μένων ῥημάτων αὐτῶν τῶν δίκην ὑδάτων παρασυρόντων τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ  
 ἀποπνιγόντων αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ ἀλλοτριώσει τοῦ ὀρθοῦ φρονήματος. στε-  
 80 ρεοῦνται δὲ μᾶλλον καὶ συμπήσσουνται πρὸς τὴν ἀλλήλων ὁμονοίαν καὶ  
 συνάγονται πρὸς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ἴσα τυρῶ, καὶ ἐν πνεῦμα πάντες ἀποτε-  
 λοῦνται, τὴν προθυμίαν τε αὐξάνουσι καὶ τὰς συνάξεις πληθύνουσι καὶ  
 κατακυριεύουσι, καθάπερ γῆς, τῆς διδαχῆς τῶν διαιρουμένων ἀπὸ τῆς  
 ἐκκλησίας.
- 85 4. Πῶς δὲ τοῦτο γίνεται καὶ τὰ πρόσωπα ἐν ταῖς εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν  
 συνάξεσι πληθύνονται καὶ εἰς προθυμίαν αὐξάνονται, κατακυριεύουσι τῶν  
 ἐπιβουλευόντων αὐτοῖς; ἐγὼ λέγω. ὅταν οἱ στοιχοῦντες τῷ ἑαυτῶν φρονή-  
 ματι καὶ τῇ πλάνῃ τῆς διανοίας αὐτῶν περιπατοῦντες θεωρήσωσιν ὑμᾶς  
 τοὺς ἐν ἀπλανεῖ γνώσει μένοντας, σχολάζοντας συνεχῶς ἐν ταῖς  
 90 ἐκκλησίαις καὶ τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ τῶν ἀγίων πατέρων προσανέχοντας· τού-  
 τους δὲ ὡς πολεμίους ἀποστρεφόμενους καὶ μηδόλως κἂν ἄκροις ὡσὶ  
 καταδεχομένους τὴν διδασκαλίαν αὐτῶν, καταγνόντες ἑαυτῶν ὡς ἐβδε-  
 λυγμένον φρόνημα ἔχοντες, καταλήψουσι τὴν πλάνην τοῦ ἰδίου φρονήμα-  
 τος καὶ ἀποστήσονται τῶν σχισμάτων καὶ προσκολληθήσονται ὑμῖν ὡς  
 95 μέλος σώματι καὶ κτήσονται τὸ αὐτὸ φρόνημα, καὶ ἔσεσθε πάντες μία  
 ἐκκλησία. καὶ οὕτω λοιπὸν, προσιθεμένων αὐτῶν ὑμῖν, αὐξάνεται τὸ σῶμα  
 τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ συμβιβάζονται τὰ μέλη πρὸς τὴν ὁλοκληρίαν καὶ  
 κρατύνεται ἡ ἐκκλησία καὶ εἰς πλήθος καὶ εἰς συνέχειαν ἐπεκτείνεται καὶ  
 μία κεφαλὴ πάντων ἡμῶν ὁ Χριστὸς ὁράται, συνέχων καὶ συσφίγγων ἡμᾶς  
 100 πρὸς ἑαυτὸν καὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους τῷ συνδέσμῳ τῆς μιᾶς πίστεως καὶ τοῦ  
 ἑνὸς φρονήματος καὶ τῆς μιᾶς ἐκκλησίας. οὕτω μὲν οὖν οἱ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ  
 τοῦ θεοῦ παραμένοντες διατρέφονται καὶ ζωογονοῦνται καὶ τὴν πνευμα-  
 τικὴν αὐξάνονται προκοπὴν, τοῖς θείοις λόγοις καὶ τοῖς πόνοις τῶν κατὰ  
 θεὸν πολιτευσαμένων διηνεκῶς ἀρδόμενοι· ὅπερ γάρ ἐστι τὸ σιτίον τῷ  
 105 σώματι, τοῦτο πέφυκεν ὁ θεὸς λόγος τῇ ψυχῇ.
5. Ἐπόμενον δὲ ἐστὶ λοιπὸν δεῖξαι καὶ οἷαν λύμην ὑφίστανται οἱ τῆς  
 ἐκκλησίας διῆστάμενοι καὶ τὸ σῶμα ταύτης διαμερίζόμενοι. ὁ μὴ εἰσερχό-  
 μενος εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐστέρηται τῆς ἱερᾶς καὶ λογικῆς τραπέζης, ἐν ᾗ οὐ  
 θύματα γεηρά, οὐ κρεῶν στιβάσματα, οὐ διαφορούμενα ὀψώνια πρόκειν-  
 110 ται, ἀλλὰ θαύματα τῶν ἀγίων μαρτύρων καὶ θεωρήματα ἱερῶν ἀνδρῶν καὶ  
 κατορθώματα τῶν ἀγίων πατέρων προτίθενται. τοὺς μὲν ἐπιδημοῦντας ἐν

76 καὶ σπαρακτῶν deest in A      79-80 στερεοῦνται A      88 θεωρήσουσιν A  
 91-92 καὶ μηδόλως...καταδεχομένους deest in A      96 ἡμῖν A      99 ὑμῶν A  
 101 ὑμᾶς A      οὕτω μὲν οὖν: οὗτοι μὲν A      106 ὑφίσταται A      109 οὐ κρεῶν...δια-  
 φορούμενα deest in A      111 ἀγίων: μακαρίων A

temptation of running after the foul, treacherous and absurd teaching of the schismatics who have severed themselves from the church. They are not dispersed, nor are they scattered by the schismatics' distorted words which, like flood waters, carry away and drown the soul by alienation from the orthodox way of thought. Rather, like cheese, they turn solid and congeal in their concord with one another and are brought together in the church. They all effect a unity of spirit, they grow in their eagerness, multiply their assemblies and gain control (as over the earth) of the teaching of those who separate themselves from the church.

4. How does this happen? How do the faithful increase attendance at their church assemblies and grow in eagerness and hold sway over those who plot against them? I will tell you. Those who are content with their own way of thinking and wander around in the error of their minds will consider how you abide in unerring knowledge and are constant in your attendance in the churches and are attentive to the teaching of the holy Fathers; they will consider how they are turned away like enemies with not even the most superficial trappings of their teaching being accepted. Then, after condemning themselves for their abhorrent way of thinking, they will comprehend the error of their beliefs, refrain from schisms, cleave to you as a member to a body, acquire the same way of thinking, and you will all be one church. And so, from then on, with the addition of these people, the body of the church will grow and the members will be brought together into one whole; the church will become strong and develop in numbers and cohesiveness; Christ will visibly be the one head of us all, holding us together and binding us to himself and to one another by the bond of one faith, one mind and one church. So then, those who remain in the church of God receive nourishment and life and make spiritual progress because they are continuously fostered on the divine words and labours of those who have dedicated their lives to God, for the divine word provides for the soul what bread provides for the body.

5. There remains for us to show what sort of harm is suffered by those who separate themselves from the church and divide up its body. The man who does not attend church has deprived himself of the holy and spiritual table on which no earthly sacrifices are offered, no mounds of meat and no variety of victuals; rather, the marvels of the holy martyrs are offered there, the doctrines of holy men and the triumphs of the holy Fathers. As for those who stay in the church and gladly listen to these, they embark upon the life of blessedness, but in the case of those who absent themselves from the church and break off communion with the faithful, fleeing from their brothers as from enemies, they are cast out of the kingdom of heaven and sent to a land suffering a famine of everything good. And in order that

- αὐτῇ καὶ ἡδέως ἀκρωμένους αὐτῶν, εἰς τὴν μακαρίαν ζωὴν ἐμβιβάζονται · τοὺς δὲ ἀποδημοῦντας ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ τὴν μετὰ τῶν πιστῶν κοινωνίαν ἀποσειομένους καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀδελφῶν φεύγοντας ὡς ἀπὸ
- 115 ἐχθρῶν, ἐκβάλλονται τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ εἰς χώραν λιμοῦ παντὸς ἀγαθοῦ παραπέμπονται. καὶ ἵνα μάθῃς ὅτι λιμώττουσιν ἀληθῶς οἱ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀποσκιρτῶντες καὶ τῆς τῶν θείων ῥημάτων ἀκροάσεως ἑαυτοὺς ἀποδιστῶντες, ἄκουσον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν σχήματι ἀπειλῆς τοῦτο ἀναφωνοῦντος · *δώσω γὰρ αὐτοῖς, φησὶν, οὐ λιμὸν ἄρτου, οὐδὲ δίψαν ὕδατος,*
- 120 *ἀλλὰ λιμὸν τοῦ ἀκοῦσαι λόγον θεοῦ.* ὁρᾷς εἰς οἷαν κόλασιν ὀλισθαίνουσιν οἱ τῆς ἐκκλησίας καταφρονοῦντες, ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς δὲ καὶ ἐν τοῖς θεάτροις καὶ ἐν ταῖς οἰκίαις διημερεῦοντες; εἶδος γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο τιμωρίας ἐστὶ, τὸ συνεῖναι λιμῷ φημί τοῦ ἀκοῦσαι λόγον θεοῦ, καὶ τιμωρίας τῆς πικροτάτης καὶ χείρονος. εἰ γὰρ ἡ ἀκρόασις καὶ ἡ μελέτη τῶν θείων λόγων ζωογονοῦσι
- 125 τὴν ψυχὴν, εὐδηλον πάντως ὅτι ὁ ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας μακρυσμὸς καὶ ἡ τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ γινομένων ἀναγνώσεων καὶ διδαχῶν ἀποδιάστασις θάνατον εὐρίσκονται τῇ ψυχῇ · ὡς γὰρ ἀδύνατον σῶμα χωρὶς αἰσθητῆς τροφῆς διαζῆν, οὕτω καὶ ψυχὴν ἀδύνατον χωρὶς γνώσεως θεοῦ καὶ πολιτείας ἀγαθῆς διασώζεσθαι. γινώσιν δὲ θεοῦ καὶ πολιτείαν ἀγαθὴν ἡ μετὰ συνέ-
- 130 σεως ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ παράστασις δωρεῖσθαι πέφυκεν · ὥστε λοιπὸν εἰ οἱ μακρύνοντες ἑαυτοὺς ἀπ' αὐτῆς ἀπόλλονται, ἐξολοθρεύονται πάντως οἱ ἀποδημοῦντες αὐτῆς. οἱ δὲ σχολάζοντες ἐν αὐτῇ καὶ προσκολλώμενοι αὐτῇ ἀγαθὸν λιμένα ἔχουσιν αὐτὴν καὶ οἱ τιθέμενοι τὴν διάνοιαν εἰς σύνεσιν τῆς θείας ἀκροάσεως τῶν ἰδίων ψυχῶν φρούριον εὐρίσκουσιν αὐτήν.
- 135 6. Οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι οἱ γονεῖς οἱ τὰ ἑαυτῶν τέκνα μαθεῖν γράμματα θέλοντες πρὸς τὴν σχολὴν ἀπάγουσι καὶ τῷ διδασκάλῳ παραδιδούσι, καὶ οὕτω ταῦτα τὴν τῶν στοιχείων ἀνάγνωσιν ἐκδιδάσκονται καὶ εἰς τὴν γνῶσιν τῶν γραμμάτων ἀναβαίνουσιν; πῶς οὖν οἱ ἔξω τῆς ἐκκλησίας χρονίζοντες καὶ καταστρέφειν αὐτὴν ὀρεγόμενοι καὶ τὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ
- 140 διδασκαλίαν ἀκούειν διὰ τῶν εὐαγγελίων μὴ θέλοντες τὴν ἑαυτῶν γνῶσιν σωτηρίαν καὶ εἰς ἀγάπην καὶ κατὰληψιν αὐτῆς κινηθῇσονται; οὐδαμῶς. εἰ γὰρ ἔξω τοῦ σχολίου καὶ χωρὶς τοῦ διδασκάλου οἱ παῖδες παιδεύονται γράμματα, εὐρήσουσι καὶ αὐτοὶ τὴν ἰδίαν σωτηρίαν δίχα τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. εἰ δὲ ἐκεῖνο ἀδύνατον, καὶ τοῦτο πάντως ἐπιγινώσκετε ἐκ τῆς
- 145 ἐκείνου ἀποδείξεως, τὴν τούτου συνορῶντες ἀλήθειαν. ὅτι δὲ ὁ τῶν κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν συνάξεων ἀπολιμπανόμενος καὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ ἐπιτελουμένων φρικτῶς ἱερωτάτων μυστηρίων ἀπεχόμενος ἀνυπότακτος γίνεται πρὸς Χριστὸν καὶ ἀθετητῆς αὐτοῦ δείκνυται, καὶ διὰ ταῦτα ἐλεεινῶς ἐξ αὐτοῦ

112 ἐμβιβάζονται conieci: ἐμβιβάζοντα BA 118 ἀποδιστῶντες B θεοῦ: κυρίου  
 A 126 γενομένων A θάνατον correxi: θάνατος BA 131 πάντες A 143 καὶ<sup>2</sup>  
 deest in A

you may learn how truly starved are those who rebel from the church and separate themselves from hearing the divine words, listen to God who makes this announcement by way of a threat: for he says to them, 'I will give them not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the word of the Lord.'<sup>5</sup> Do you see what sort of punishment they have fallen into who despise the church and pass their days in the markets, the theatres and their houses? For this is a form of retribution, a retribution of the worst and most bitter sort, namely, to live with a famine of hearing the word of God. If hearing and studying the divine words give life to the soul, it is very clear indeed that alienation from the church and separation from the readings and teachings given there bring death upon the soul, for as the body cannot continue to live without sensible nourishment so too the soul cannot be preserved without knowledge of God and good moral conduct. Knowledge of God and good moral conduct are bestowed through mindful attendance in church, so that, for the rest, if those who distance themselves from her are wiped out, those who absent themselves from her are destroyed utterly. But those who are assiduous in their attendance and cleave to the church have her as a fine harbour and those who set their minds to understand the divine truths they are hearing discover her as a citadel for their own souls.

6. Do you not know that parents who want an education for their children take them to school and hand them over to a teacher and in this way the children are taught to read the alphabet and they become acquainted with the written language? How then shall those who waste their time outside the church, whose aim is to subvert it and who refuse to listen to the teaching of Christ in the Gospels—how shall they come to know their own salvation and be moved towards a love and understanding of it? There is no way at all! For if children can acquire an education outside school and without a teacher, these people too will find their own salvation apart from the church and Christ. But if the former is impossible, you should certainly recognize the impossibility of the latter on the basis of the previous proof when you understand the truth in this. The man who abandons the liturgical assemblies of the church and abstains from the most sacred mysteries, awesomely celebrated there, is disobedient before Christ and shows himself to be a traitor to him. On this account he pitifully separates himself from Christ, even though he confesses him, calls himself a Christian and apparently struggles on

<sup>5</sup> Am 8:11.

χωρίζεται, κἂν καὶ Χριστὸν ὁμολογεῖ καὶ χριστιανὸς ὀνομάζεται καὶ ὑπὲρ  
 150 Χριστοῦ δῆθεν ἀγωνίζεται, φανερόν ἐστι τοῦτο καὶ ἐκ τῶν θείων γραφῶν  
 καὶ τῶν κοινῶν ἐννοιῶν· *ἐὰν μὴ φάγητε τὴν σάρκα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ  
 πίητε αὐτοῦ τὸ αἷμα, οὐκ ἔχετε ζωὴν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς. ὁ τρώγων μου τὴν σάρκα καὶ  
 πίνων μου τὸ αἷμα ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον· καὶ ἐν ἐμοὶ μένει ἀγὰρ ἐν αὐτῷ.*

7. Εἰ οὖν προσφερόμενα δῶρα ἐν τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ ὁ ἄρτος καὶ ὁ οἶνος  
 155 παρὰ τῶν εὐσεβῶν ἱερέων εἰς σῶμα καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ διὰ τῆς ἐπιφοιτή-  
 σεως τοῦ παναγίου πνεύματος μεταποιούμενα ἀληθῶς σῶμα καὶ αἷμα  
 Χριστοῦ ἔστι τε καὶ λέγεται, ἱερουργούμενα παρὰ τῶν ὀρθοδόξων πιστῶν  
 ἱερέων, ταῦτα δὲ οὐ προσδέχεται τις, οὐδὲ προσέρχεται ἐν αὐτοῖς, ἀλλὰ  
 τῆς μεταλήψεως αὐτῶν ἀπέχεται, οὐκ ἐβδελυγμένα ἡγεῖται αὐτά; οὐ  
 160 πεπλανημένας ὑπολήψεις ἔχει περὶ αὐτῶν; οὐ διὰ τοῦτο πλάνον ἡγεῖται  
 τὸν Χριστὸν ὥς οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι; οὐ διὰ τὸ ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν ἁγίων δώρων  
 προδήλως χωρίζεται τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ κρίνει καὶ κατακρίνει τὸν Χριστόν;  
 οὐ ραπίζει, οὐ κολαφίζει, οὐ μυκτηρίζει, οὐκ ἐμπαίζει αὐτῷ;

8. Σαφῶς κατανοεῖτε τὴν ἀνομίαν, ἀδελφοί μου, παρακαλῶ· προσέ-  
 165 χετε τοῖς λεγομένοις ἀκριβῶς. τὰ παρὰ τῶν ὀρθοδόξων ἱερέων τελούμενα  
 ἅγια δῶρα ὁμολογουμένως σῶμα καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ γίνονται, εἰς τοῦτο  
 ἐρχόμενα διὰ τῆς τῶν εὐχῶν ἐπικλήσεως καὶ τῆς ἐπιδημίας τοῦ ἁγίου  
 πνεύματος. ἐπειδὴ ταῦτα οὕτως ἔχει καὶ οὕτως ἀπλανῶς φρονούμεν τε καὶ  
 πιστεύομεν, ὁ τῆς σωτηριώδους αὐτῶν μεταλήψεως μὴ μετέχων, ἀποστρε-  
 170 φόμενος δὲ αὐτά, οὐκ ἀριδῆλως φεύγει αὐτά ὥς κοινὸν ἄρτον καὶ οἶνον;  
 οὐ καταπατεῖ τὸ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα τοῦ κυρίου; οὐ φρονεῖ αὐτὰ ἁγιασμοῦ  
 ἀνεπίδεκτα; οὐ ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν κύριον δογματίζει; οὐκ εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν  
 δόξαν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις κατολισθαίνει; οὐκ ἀνασταυροῖ τὸν Χριστόν, ἀπο-  
 πεμπόμενος αὐτά ὥς μηδεμίαν παρέχοντα ὄνησιν; οὐ κράζει πρὸς τοὺς  
 175 ἄλλους, φεύγετε, φεύγετε τὴν μετάληψιν τῶν μυστηρίων, ὥς Ἰουδαῖοι τὸ  
*σταύρωσον, σταύρωσον αὐτόν*; οὐ διὰ τὸ δοξάζειν ἔνοχα καταφθορᾶς καὶ  
 ἀφανισμοῦ τὰ ἀθάνατα μυστήρια ὥς Ἰουδαῖοι ἔνοχον θανάτου ψηφίζεται  
 τὸν τοῦ θανάτου καταλύτην καὶ τῆς ζωῆς χορηγὸν κύριον; οὐ διὰ τοὺς  
 δυσφήμους λόγους οὓς προσφέρει περὶ αὐτῶν, μᾶλλον δὲ κατ' αὐτῶν καὶ  
 180 τῆς λοιπῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς καταστάσεως, τὴν τοῦ ἀγνώμονος ληστοῦ  
 βλάσφημον γνῶσιν καὶ γνῶμην καὶ γλῶσσαν οἰκείουται καὶ φανεροῖ; οὐ διὰ  
 τῆς ἀμεθεξίας τοῦ δεσποτικοῦ σώματος λέγει πρὸς τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ λογισμοὺς  
 καὶ τοὺς πειθομένους αὐτῷ ἀνθρώπους· δεῦτε καὶ προσάψωμεν αὐτοῖς  
 φρόνημα θνητῆς σαρκὸς καὶ αἵματος νεκροῦ, ψιλοῦ ἄρτου καὶ κοινοῦ  
 185 ποτηρίου, καὶ ἐκφύγωμεν αὐτά ὥς μὴ παρέχοντα ζωὴν; οὐχὶ καὶ ὁ προ-

154 τὰ προφερόμενα A  
 ἀπέχεσθαι: ἀπέρχεσθαι A  
 Ἰουδαίοις transp. A

158 τις post προσέρχεται add A  
 162 καὶ: οὐ A  
 166 ὁμολογοῦμεν B

161 οἱ deest in B  
 173 δόξαν post



Christ's behalf. This is evident from sacred scripture and common sense. 'Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, you have no life in you; he who eats my flesh and drinks my blood has eternal life; and he abides in me and I in him.'<sup>6</sup>

7. If then the bread and wine offered as gifts upon the altar and transformed by pious priests into the body and blood of Christ through the visitation of the all-holy Spirit are truly called and are in reality the body and blood of Christ consecrated by faithful, orthodox priests, and if someone neither receives nor approaches them but abstains from partaking of them, is he not considering them as abhorrent? Does he not entertain erroneous notions in their regard? Does he not for this reason consider Christ an impostor as do the Jews? Because of his abstention from the sacred gifts does he not separate himself from Christ as well as judge and condemn Christ? Does he not strike, slap, sneer and mock at Christ?

8. My brothers, please consider the transgression wisely and pay attention to my words. The sacred gifts consecrated by orthodox priests are confessed to be the body and blood of Christ; this takes place through the invocation prayers and the advent of the Holy Spirit. Since this is the reality and this is our unerring faith and way of thinking, the man who does not partake of saving communion in these gifts but rather avoids them, is he not clearly fleeing them as ordinary bread and wine? Does he not trample underfoot the body and blood of the Lord? Does he not consider them incapable of receiving sanctification? Is he not teaching a doctrine of the Lord as a mere man?<sup>7</sup> Does he not sink to the same opinion as the Jews? In rejecting these gifts as offering nothing of value, does he not crucify Christ anew?<sup>8</sup> Does he not cry out to others, 'Flee, flee communion in the mysteries!', as the Jews cried, 'Crucify him, crucify him!'<sup>9</sup> In thinking that the immortal mysteries are liable to corruption and destruction, does he not, like the Jews, judge the Lord who is the deliverer from death and the provider of life to be liable to death? By the abusive words he proffers regarding the sacred mysteries, or rather against them and the rest of the established church, does he not manifestly make the blasphemous knowledge, mind and tongue of the hardened thief his own?<sup>10</sup> By refusing to partake of the body of the Lord does he not say within his own thoughts and to the men he persuades, 'Come, let us ascribe to these mysteries the notion of mortal flesh and dead blood, simple bread and a cup of ordinary wine, and let us

<sup>6</sup> Jn 6:53-54, 56.

<sup>7</sup> i.e., the heresy traditionally attributed to Paul of Samosata.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Heb 6:6.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Mk 15:13-14.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Mt 27:38,44 and Mk 15:27.

- φήτης τὴν κατὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ μανίαν τῶν Ἰουδαίων προλέγων καὶ θριαμβεύων ἐνδύεται τὸ πρόσωπον τῶν σταυρωσάντων καὶ ὡς ἐξ αὐτῶν λέγει, *δεῦτε καὶ ἐμβάλωμεν ξύλον εἰς τὸν ἄρτον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκτρίψωμεν αὐτὸν ἀπὸ βίβλου ζώντων*; οὐχὶ καθάπερ λόγχῃ, τοῖς ἀδίκους ἐλέγχους, οἷς πειράται καθ' ἡμέραν ἀποδεικνύειν δικαίως εἶναι τὴν ἀποχὴν τῶν μυστηρίων, τιτρώσκει τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων διάνοιαν καὶ λογχεύει τὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος πλευράν; οὐ δι' ὧν πράττει καὶ λέγει τὸν θεὸν παροξύνων καὶ παροργίζων ἴσα τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις χολὴν καὶ ὄξος προσφέρει τῷ κυρίῳ; οὐ χείρων ὁ τοιοῦτος καὶ αὐτῶν Ἰουδαίων καταφαίνεται, ἐκείνοι γὰρ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ κρεμαμένον οὐ κατέαξαν αὐτοῦ τὰ σκέλη; *ὅσοι γὰρ οὐ συντριβήσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ*. ὁ δὲ τὰ μυστηρίων γέμοντα δεσποτικά ῥήματα καὶ δίκην ὁσῶν συνέχοντα τὴν τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν ζωὴν, ἔτι δὲ καὶ τοὺς κανόνες, τὰς διατάξεις καὶ τοὺς λόγους τῶν θείων πατέρων τῶν περὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας διαγορευόντων συντρίβει καὶ καταλύει καὶ ἄκυρα ἔργοις αὐτοῖς καταψηφίζεται.
- 200 9. Καὶ οἱ μὲν *διεμερίσαντο τὰ ἱμάτια τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἱματισμὸν αὐτοῦ ἔβαλον κλῆρον*. ὁ δὲ τὰ ὀρθὰ φρονήματα τῶν πιστῶν τὰ σκέποντα καὶ συντηροῦντα τὴν ἔνωσιν καὶ τὴν ὁμονοίαν καὶ τὸν σύνδεσμον τῆς ἐκκλησίας οὐ διαμερίζει μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ καταμερίζει εἰς διαφόρους συναγωγάς, σχίζων καὶ κατατέμνων τὴν μίαν ἐκκλησίαν· ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ὀνομασμὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ βάλλει κλήσεις ἀνθρώπων, τὸ σωτήριον ὄνομα ἐκβαλλούσας ἀπὸ τῶν ἐνδυσαμένων αὐτὸ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος καὶ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ καλεῖσθαι ἡξιωμένων. παρασκευάζει γὰρ τοὺς εἰς πολλὰ τμήματα γενομένους καὶ εἰς διαφόρους συνάξεις, ἢ μᾶλλον παρατάξεις, κατασταθέντας, καὶ διαφόρων ἀρχηγῶν ὀνόμασιν ἀσέμνως σεμνύνεσθαι καὶ ἐκ πολλῶν ἡγεμόνων κατονομάζεσθαι. ὁ μὲν γὰρ λέγει ὅτι τοῦ δεῖνά εἰμι πατριάρχου, ὁ δὲ τοῦ δεῖνα· ἄλλος τοῦ τούτου ἀρχιερέως, ἕτερος ἐκείνου· καὶ οὕτω μερίζεται ὁ ἀμέριστος καὶ εἰς Χριστός. καὶ ὥσπερ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ βασιλείαν παραιτησάμενοι ὑπὸ Καίσαρος ἀρχὴν ὑπεκλήθησαν, οὕτω καὶ αὐτοί, τὴν κεφαλὴν πάντων ἡμῶν τὸν Χριστὸν ἀφέντες
- 215 πλουτεῖν κεφαλὴν, κεφαλὰς ἀλλοτρίας ἐφ' ἑαυτοὺς ἐπεσπάσαντο. καὶ ὅπερ ἐν τοῖς μαχομένοις ὁρᾶται τελούμενον, τοῦτο καὶ ἐν τούτοις ἀτεχνῶς διαπράττεται. ὥς γὰρ οἱ πρὸς πόλεμον εὐτρεπιζόμενοι διὰ τὸ ἀκμαῖον τῆς μάχης εἰς μερισμοὺς παρατάξεων διαιροῦνται καὶ σημεία καὶ ὀνόματα διάφορα πρὸς γνωρισμὸν ἑαυτοῖς περιάπτουσι καὶ ἐν τῇ συρραγῇ τοῦ
- 220 πολέμου βοῶσιν ἀτάκτως καὶ ὠμότατα μαίνονται καὶ παρανάλωμα σφαγῆς γίνονται, οὕτω καὶ αὐτοὶ τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν εἰρήνην καὶ ὁμοφρο-

186 τοῦ deest in A 190 ἀποδεικνύει δικαίαν A  
πατρὸς A 193 χείρων correxi: χοίρων B, χείρον A  
197 τε post διατάξεις add. A 215 ἀπεσπάσαντο A

τιτρώσκειν A 191 σωτῆρος:  
194 τῶν ante Ἰουδαίων add. A

flee them for they offer no life”? In foretelling and publicizing the madness of the Jews against Christ, does the prophet not take on the person of those who crucified him and say as one of them, ‘Come, let us cast wood into his bread and expunge him from the book of the living’?<sup>11</sup> With his unjust accusations with which he daily tries to prove that it is right to abstain from the mysteries, does he not wound as with a lance the minds of men and thrust a spear into the Saviour’s side?<sup>12</sup> By what he does and says, vexing and angering God, does he not offer to the Lord gall and vinegar? Does such a man not appear worse than even the Jews themselves, for they did not break his bones while he hung upon the cross? ‘For not a bone of him shall be broken.’<sup>13</sup> But this man smashes and destroys and by his very deeds judges invalid the Lord’s own words which are laden with mystery and which like bones hold together the life of our souls. He smashes also the canons, the ordinances and the words of the divine Fathers who gave detailed instructions concerning the church.

9. On the one hand, ‘they divided Christ’s garments and cast lots for his tunic.’<sup>14</sup> This sort of man, on the other hand, not only introduces division among the orthodox beliefs of the faithful which keep and preserve the unity, concord and bond of the church, but also he instigates the formation of various factions, thus splitting and rending asunder the unity of the church. Moreover, he replaces the name of Christ with human appellations which remove the saving name from those who were clothed with it in baptism and who have been deemed worthy to be called by it.<sup>15</sup> When they have split into many factions and have set themselves up in diverse congregations, or rather, sectarian conventicles, he has them take ignominious pride in various leaders and name themselves after many chiefs. One says, ‘I am for Patriarch so and so’, while another says, ‘I am for so and so.’<sup>16</sup> One says, ‘I am for this bishop’; another says, ‘I am for that one.’ And in this way the one and undivided Christ is divided up.<sup>17</sup> Just as the Jews, rejected the kingdom of Christ and named themselves under Caesar’s rule,<sup>18</sup> so too these people, in turning aside from Christ the head of us all, have allowed a plethora of leaders to spring up and have taken to themselves leaders other than Christ. What happens among men in battle really occurs also among these people. As men prepare for war, looking to the heat of battle, they divide themselves into distinct ranks and

<sup>11</sup> Jer 11:19.

<sup>12</sup> Jn 19:34.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Jn 19:36, Ex 12:46, Num 9:12, Ps 33:20.

<sup>14</sup> Ps 22:19, Jn 19:24, Mt 27:35, Mk 15:24, Lk 23:34.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. John Cheilas, *Against the Arsenites* 3.2 (370.19-21): τοὺς μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦδε, τοὺς δ’ ἀπὸ τοῦδε πάλιν βουλομένους καλεῖσθαι καὶ μερίζοντας διὰ τοῦτο Χριστὸν τὸν ἀμέριστον, εἰς δὲ καὶ βεβαπτίσμεθα μόνον.

<sup>16</sup> The patriarchs in question are, of course, Arsenios and Joseph.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. 1 Cor 1:12-13.

<sup>18</sup> Jn 19:12-15.

σύνην ἀποβαλλόμενοι διὰ τὸ διάφορον τοῦ φρονήματος εἰς σχίσματα καὶ παρατάξεις κατετμήθησαν καὶ ἕκαστος, ὣν ἡβουλήθη τῶν ἀνθρώπων, εἰς κεφαλὴν ἑαυτῷ προεχειρίσατο. ὅθεν καὶ ταῖς κατ' ἀλλήλων ὕβρεσι καὶ  
 225 κατηγορίαις καὶ φιλονικίαις βαλλόμενοι, θάνατον ψυχῆς ἐμπορεύονται.

10. Ἱμάτια τοῦ Χριστοῦ οἱ χριστιανοὶ οἱ τὸ σῶμα Χριστοῦ, τὴν ἐκκλησίαν φημί, περικυκλοῦντες διὰ τῆς ἐκεῖσε διατριβῆς καὶ περικαλύπτοντες αὐτὴν διὰ τῆς κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν θείων φυλακῆς. ἱματισμὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡ ἀρχιερωσύνη, ἄνωθεν ὑφαινομένη καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ  
 230 ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐνεργουμένη. ἀκριβῶς οὖν γινωσκέτωσαν ἅπαντες, ὅτι ὅσοι ἐν καιροῖς ὀρθοδοξίας κωλύουσι τοὺς χριστιανοὺς εἰσερχεσθαι εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ παραινοῦσιν ἀπέχεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς μεταλήψεως τῶν θείων μυστηρίων καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἁγιασμάτων καὶ τὴν ἱερωσύνην ἀθετοῦσι καί, ὅσον τὸ εἰς αὐτοὺς, καθαιροῦσι τοὺς ἀξιόους ἱερεῖς καὶ ὡς κληρὸν τινα  
 235 πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς τὴν ἱερωσύνην ἐπάγονται καὶ μόνους ἑαυτοὺς ἱερεῖς ἐπιγράφονται, φιλοδοξίας καὶ φιλοκερδείας βαλλόμενοι δόρατι, οὐκ εἰσὶ χριστιανοί, οὐκ εἰσὶ μοναχοί, οὐκ εἰσὶν ἱερεῖς, οὐκ εἰσὶν ἀρχιερεῖς, ἀλλὰ πλάνοι καὶ παραβάται, πολέμιοι καὶ στρατιῶται, τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἔχοντες τὴν γνώμην καὶ τὸν τρόπον. ὥς γὰρ οἱ εἰς Χριστὸν ἐνυβρίσαντες κεχωρισμένοι τοῦ  
 240 Χριστοῦ τυγχάνουσιν, οὕτω καὶ οἱ τὰ παρὰ τῶν ὀρθοδόξων ἱερέων ἱεουργούμενα ἅγια δῶρα ὡς κοινὰ ἀποστρεφόμενοι, ὥς εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν Χριστὸν καὶ αὐτοὶ παροينوῦντες, ἀλλότριοι τοῦ Χριστοῦ πεφύκασιν. εἰ οὗτοι ἐν φρονήματι καὶ πράγματι τοιούτοις κρατούμενοι μετὰ τῆς μοίρας τῶν εὐσεβῶν τάττονται, ταπτέσθωσαν καὶ Ἰουδαῖοι μεθ' ἡμῶν. εἰ δὲ ἐκεῖνοι  
 245 ἐχθροὶ καὶ εἰσὶ καὶ λέγονται, ὥς διαμερισάμενοι τὰ ἱμάτια τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἱματισμὸν αὐτοῦ θέμενοι κληρὸν, προδῆλως καὶ οὗτοι ἐχθροὶ ὥς διαμεριζόμενοι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ τὴν ἱερωσύνην κατέχοντες ὥς κληρὸν ἴδιον καὶ τοὺς πιστευομένους ὀρθοδόξῳ διανοίᾳ καὶ δικαίῳ βίῳ ἱεουργεῖν τῆς ἱερωσύνης ἐκβάλλοντες.
- 250 11. Εἰ δὲ λέγουσιν ὅτι, ἀκρίβειαν ἀντιποιοῦμενοι καὶ ὑπὲρ εὐσεβείας ἀγωνιζόμενοι, τὰ τοιαῦτα καὶ κηρύττουσι καὶ ἐργάζονται καὶ τοῖς τοιούτοις ῥήμασιν ἑαυτοὺς δικαιοῦσιν, ἴστωσαν ὅτι *προφασίζονται προφάσεις ἐν ἁμαρτίαις*. ἐγγύθεν γὰρ αὐτοῖς ὁ ἔλεγχος ἀκολουθεῖ. εἰ ἐκ τούτου τοῦ λόγου δικαιωθήσονται, ἀθωωθήσονται πάντως καὶ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι· καὶ γὰρ ὅσα  
 255 οὗτοι παράνομα κατὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰργάσαντο, νόμου δὴθεν ἀντεχόμενοι καὶ εὐσεβεῖν οἰόμενοι καὶ τῷ θεῷ χαριζόμενοι ταῦτα εἰργάσαντο. ἐὰν οὖν

230 γινωσκέτωσαν *con*texi: γινωσκέτοσαν B, ἐγινωσκέτωσαν A 235 πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς  
 post ἱερωσύνην *transp.* A 239 οἱ *deest* in A 241 τὸν *deest* in A 242 παραι-  
 νοῦντες A 245 τοῦ *deest* in A 254 οἱ *deest* in A

assign various signals and names to themselves for the purpose of identification; yet, in the clash of combat they cry out in disarray and, raging with savage cruelty, they are uselessly slaughtered. So too these people, in rejecting peace and concord in the church on account of diversity of opinion, have parcelled themselves into schismatic groups and ranks and each has picked a head for himself from the men of his choice. Pelted by their mutual insults, accusations and contentions, they procure death for the soul.

10. Christians constitute the garments of Christ: they surround the body of Christ, namely, the church, by their presence there and cover her by their preservation of the divine truths of tradition. The episcopacy constitutes the tunic of Christ, woven above and wrought by the grace of the Holy Spirit.<sup>19</sup> Therefore, let everyone know with certainty that those who in times of orthodoxy hinder Christians from attending church and advise them to abstain from communion in the divine mysteries and the rest of the means of sanctification and who reject the priesthood and, as far as they are able, depose worthy priests and arrogate the priesthood to themselves as a kind of lot and designate only themselves as priests—such men are struck with a spear of glory-seeking and greed; they are not Christians, not monks, not priests, not bishops, but traitors and transgressors, enemies and soldiers; they have the mind and manner of the Jews. As those who mocked Christ became separated from Christ, so too those who reject the holy gifts consecrated by orthodox priests as ordinary, because they too cast insults at Christ himself, they have become estranged from Christ. If those who are dominated in belief and practice by such men range themselves with the lot of the orthodox, let the Jews too find a place in our ranks. But if the Jews are both called enemies and are indeed such because they have divided Christ's garments and cast lots for his tunic,<sup>20</sup> these people too are clearly enemies because they have divided up the church and seized the priesthood as their own lot and because they cast out from the priesthood those entrusted with priestly ministry by virtue of their orthodox belief and righteous life.

11. But if, while claiming they are contending for a rigorist position and struggling on behalf of orthodoxy, they both proclaim and do things like these in order to justify themselves with words like these, let them know that 'they are making excuses for their sins.'<sup>21</sup> The refutation follows close on their heels. If they

<sup>19</sup> Or perhaps, 'woven from top to bottom' (cf. Jn 19:23).

<sup>20</sup> Cf. John Cheilas, *Against the Arsenites* 1.10 (357.25-28).

<sup>21</sup> Ps 140:4. The Arsenites favoured a position of ἀκρίβεια rather than one of οἰκονομία. Cf. Methodios, *De schismate vitando* 14 (PG 140:797AB): ὁ γοῦν δι' ἀκρίβειαν δῆθεν κανόνος τινὸς παραχᾶς ποιῶν, στάσεις κινῶν καὶ τὸ σῶμα σχίζων τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ὀρθοδοξία τῆς εὐσεβείας συντηρουμένης, ὁ τοιοῦτος, εἰ καὶ ἀπὸ εὐλαβείας κινεῖσθαι οἶεται, λέληθεν ἑαυτὸν (εἰρήσε-

οὗτοι διὰ τοῦτο δίκαιοι, ἀκατάκριτοι λοιπὸν καὶ οἱ προφάσει ἀκριβεῖας τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καταστρέφοντες εὐρεθήσονται.

12. Τί ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ τοῦ ματαίου φρονήματος ὄνειροπολεῖς, ἄνθρωπε,  
 260 μαχόμενος ἑαυτῷ καὶ κατὰ σεαυτοῦ εὐρεσιλόγων καὶ ματαίας ἀνα-  
 πλάττων προφάσεις; ἔστιν ὁ ἐν κλοπῇ ὑφελόμενος πράγματα συντηρεῖ τῷ  
 δεσπότῃ τὰ πράγματα; ὁ ὑβρίζων ἐπαινεῖ; ὁ πλήττων εὐεργετῇ; ὁ μαχόμε-  
 νος εἰρηνεύει; ὁ σκορπίζων συνάγει; ὁ διΐστων ἐνοποιεῖ; ὁ μισῶν ἀγαπᾷ; ὁ  
 ἐκριζῶν φυτεύει; ὁ καταλύνων οἰκοδομεῖ; ὁ κακοπραγῶν ἀγαθοεργεῖ; ὁ  
 265 διαστρέφων ἄνορθοι; ὁ καταβάλλων ἀνίστησι; τί λέγεις; γενοῦ ἐν ἑαυτῷ.  
 εἴσελθε εἰς τὸ ταμεῖον τῶν λογισμῶν σου. ἀπόρριψον ἅφ' ἑαυτοῦ σου τὰς  
 προφάσεις. ἐρεῦνησον τὸν ἐμφωλεύοντα ἐν σοὶ ὄφιν. κατὰμαθε τὸ ἐνοικοῦν  
 ἐν σοὶ σκότος. πρόσελθε τῷ φωτὶ τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ δὸς ἀπόκρισιν συντετῆν,  
 εἰ ἔχεις, καὶ αὐτίκα ἔξεις καὶ ἡμᾶς ὀπίσω σου πορευομένους ὡς ἀλήθειαν  
 270 ἀγαπῶντας. εἰ δ' οὐκ ἔχεις, τῷ ἰδιασμῷ τοῦ φρονήματος καὶ ταῖς φιλονι-  
 κίαις χαίρειν εἰπὼν, δεῦρο στήθι μεθ' ἡμῶν. εἰσέλθωμεν ἅμα πρὸς τὴν  
 ἐκκλησίαν. *ἰδοῦ, γάρ φησι, τί καλὸν ἢ τί τερπνὸν ἄλλ' ἢ τὸ κατοικεῖν ἀδελφούς*  
*ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό. τὸ κατοικεῖν ἐν οἴκῳ κυρίου πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ζωῆς αὐτῶν·*  
*τὸ θεωρεῖν τὴν τερπνότητα κυρίου καὶ ἐπισκέπτεσθαι τὸν ναὸν τὸν ἅγιον αὐτοῦ.*  
 275 *τὸ ἀγαπᾶν τὴν εὐπρέπειαν τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν τόπον τοῦ σκηνώματος τῆς*  
*δόξης αὐτοῦ.*

13. Μεγαλύνωμεν μιᾷ γλώσσῃ τὸν κύριον καὶ ὑψώσωμεν τὸ ὄνομα  
 αὐτοῦ, ἐν τῇ ἐνώσει ἡμῶν, τοῦ ὑψωθέντος ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ καὶ τὰς ἀγκάλας  
 ἀνοιξαντος καὶ τὰς παλάμας ἀπλώσαντος καὶ τὰ μακρὰ ἐπισυνάξαντος  
 280 πρὸς ἑαυτὸν καὶ τὰ διεστῶτα συνάψαντος. τὸ ἐνδέον διὰ τῆς σῆς ἀπο-  
 στασίας ἀπαρτισθήτω τῇ σῇ παρουσίᾳ. τὸ διαιρεθὲν τῷ σῷ μακρυσμῷ τῷ  
 σῷ πάλιν ἐνωθήτω προσεγγισμῷ. τῇ κατὰ σε συνεχεῖα ἢ διὰ σε διάστασις  
 συνουλωθήτω. οὐς ἐλύπησας διὰ τῆς σῆς ἀποστασίας πάλιν παρακάλεσαι  
 διὰ τῆς ἐπιστασίας. τοῦ προφητικοῦ λόγου ἢ ἀπότομος ἀπόφασις μηδόλως  
 285 ἐπὶ σοὶ τελεσθήτω, τὸ *ἀπολλύμενον ἀπολλύσθω* λέγουσα. ὡς ἀδελφοὶ σπα-  
 ραττόμεθα τῷ χωρισμῷ σου. ὡς σὰ μέλη ὀδυνώμεθα τῷ τραύματί σου.  
 ἐπιποθοῦμεν τὴν σὴν ἐπιστροφὴν πρὸ τοῦ τὴν γάγγραιναν τῆς τελευτῆς ἐν  
 σοὶ νομὴν εὐρεῖν. ἐν τῇ σῇ προαιρέσει κεῖνται καὶ ὁ θάνατος καὶ ἡ ζωὴ. οὐκ  
 ἔστι νῦν ἐν σοὶ ἀκούσιος περίστασις τὴν θέλησιν τῆς ὑγείας ἐμποδίζουσα,

258 ἀποστρέφοντες A      266 ταμεῖον B      270 ἀγαπῶντα B      271 πρὸς: εἰς A  
 272-273 τὸ κατοικεῖν ἀδελφούς ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό deest in A      279 τὰς παλάμας ἀπλώ-  
 σαντος καὶ deest in A      280-281 ἀποστασίας: ἀπουσίας A      283 παρεκάλεσον A  
 284 σῆς ante ἐπιστασίας add. A      285-286 σπαραττόμεθα A      286 ὀδυνώμεθα A

can justify themselves on these grounds, then the Jews too are entirely free of guilt, for however many unlawful deeds they committed against Christ, these they did because they were apparently holding to the law and thought they were acting piously, pleasing God. If then the Jews are just on this account, those who overturn the church on the pretext of a rigorist position will be found free of condemnation.

12. What, my good fellow, are the wild dreams you dream, fighting against yourself in the night-time of your empty mind, inventing fabulous arguments and concocting empty excuses to your own detriment? Does the thief who steals goods preserve them for the owner? Does one who mocks offer praise? Does one who strikes do good? Does the fighter offer peace? Does the scatterer bring together? Does the divider unite? Does the hater bring love? Does the man who uproots plant? Does the destroyer build? Does the evildoer do good? Does the perverter make straight? Does one who casts down raise up again? What do you say? Look at yourself. Enter the treasury of your thoughts. Cast out your excuses. Seek out the serpent lurking inside you. Learn about the darkness that finds a home within you. Approach the light of truth. Give an intelligible answer, if you have one, and immediately you will have us following behind you as lovers of truth. But if not, bid adieu to your singular way of belief and to your contentiousness and come stand with us. Let us enter the church together. For scripture says, 'Behold, what good there is or what delight, brothers dwelling together';<sup>22</sup> 'To dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of their life; to contemplate the delight of the Lord and to behold his holy temple';<sup>23</sup> 'To love the beauty of his house and the place where his glory dwells.'<sup>24</sup>

13. Let us magnify the Lord with one tongue and let us exalt his name; in our unity let us exalt the name of the one who was raised high on the cross, who opened his arms and stretched out his hands to gather the far regions to himself and to unite the separated. By your presence let him make up for what is missing because of your absence. What was separated by your estrangement, let him unite again by your drawing near. By your adherence let the breach you made be healed. Console once again by your presence those you grieved by your absence. Let not the severe sentence of the prophet's word fall upon you: 'Let the perishing perish.'<sup>25</sup> As brothers we are torn apart by your separation. As your members we are grieved by your wound. We long for your return before the gangrene of death finds a hold on you. Both life and death lie within your choice. At this moment

ται γὰρ καὶ ἐπαχθὲς) λύκος ὢν, ἔξωθεν μὲν ἐν δορᾷ προβάτων ἐρχόμενος, ἔσωθεν δὲ γέμων δόλου καὶ ἀρπαγῆς.

<sup>22</sup> Ps 132:1.

<sup>23</sup> Ps 26:4.

<sup>24</sup> Ps 25:8.

<sup>25</sup> This appears to be an imprecise quotation.

290 ἀλλ' αὐτεξούσιος προαίρεσις ἐκούσιον ἀσθένειαν ἐπισπωμένη. εἰ θέλησις  
ἀπαλλάττει τῆς νόσου, καὶ εἰ θελήσεις πάλιν, καταβαίνεις εἰς Ἄδην. ἐν ὅσῳ  
κρατεῖται ὁ ζυγὸς τῆς ἐπιστροφῆς ἐν τῇ χειρὶ τοῦ θελήματος, φάνηθι  
εὐγνώμων πρὸς τὴν σε ἀναγεννήσασαν ἐκκλησίαν. μὴ ἔσο ἐπὶ πολὺ  
ἀγνώμων υἱὸς περὶ τὴν σὴν μητέρα, κακολογῶν αὐτὴν καὶ συλαγωγῶν τὰ  
295 τέκνα αὐτῆς διὰ τῶν ὀλεθρίων ῥημάτων · μήπως, ἐν τῷ δυσφημεῖν εἰς τὰ  
ἄγια καὶ διασπᾶν τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν ἔνωσιν, ἀνελπίστως ἐπιστᾶσα ἡ  
ἐσχάτη ἡμέρα, τὴν μὲν βλάβημον γλώσσαν φιμώσῃ καὶ τὸν μάταιον  
ἀγῶνα τῆς ψυχῆς στήσῃ · τοὺς δὲ ἐπιγνώμονας λογισμοὺς ἀναστήσῃ καὶ  
ἐπαναστήσῃ κατὰ σου, αἰσχύνῃ καὶ ὄνειδος καὶ ἔλεγχον μετ' ἐπιτιμήσεως  
300 φέροντας τῇ σῇ ψυχῇ καὶ τῆς ἄνωθεν Ἱερουσαλὴμ τῆς ἀληθινῆς μητρὸς  
τῆς τῶν πρωτοτόκων ἐκκλησίας χωρίζοντάς σε ἀποτόμως διὰ τὴν ἐνταῦθα  
παρὰ σου τολμηθεῖσαν ῥῆξιν καὶ κατατομὴν τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἐκ τῆς σῆς  
κρίσεως καὶ τῶν ἔργων τὴν κατὰ σου ψῆφον ἐπάγοντας καὶ τῷ ἴσῳ τῆς  
δικαιοσύνης καταδίκης ἀπαράκλητά σε κολάζοντας.

305 **14.** Ταῦτα πρὸς τὴν σὴν ἀγάπην ἀδελφικῶς προβαλλόμεθα, προσκα-  
λούμενοί σε πρὸς καταλλαγὴν τῆς κοινῆς ἡμῶν μητρὸς τῆς ἐκκλησίας. ἀλλ'  
οὐ πειθόμεθα, οὐδὲ μεταμελούμεθα, οὐδὲ ἀνασχωζόμεθα· καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐλεοῦμεν  
ὕμᾱς, δακρύομεν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, ἐννοοῦντες τὴν τῆς ἐπαγωγῆς ἡμέραν, εἰς ἣν  
ἐαυτοὺς ὑπάγετε, ἐν ᾗ *στοιχεῖα ῥοιζηδὸν καυσούμενα λυθήσονται καὶ γῆ καὶ*  
310 *τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ πάντα ἔργα κατακαήσεται*, ὅτε καὶ μετὰμελος ὑμῖν ἀνόνητος  
ἐπελεύσεται, ὁδύνῃν βαστάζων ἀπέραντον καὶ στεναγμὸν ἀνένδοτον ·  
καταργηθήσεται γὰρ τὰ ἔργα ὑμῶν καὶ καταβήσεται εἰς Ἄδου ὑμῶν ἡ  
δόξα καὶ ἡ πολλὴ εὐφροσύνη, ὅτι ἡ ψυχὴ ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ ζωῇ ὑμῶν εὐλογηθήσε-  
ται καὶ ἕως αἰῶνος οὐκ ὄψεται φῶς. ὑποκάτω ὑμῶν στρωθήσεται σῆψις καὶ  
315 τὸ κάλυμμα ὑμῶν ἔσται σκώληξ. τὸ γὰρ ἐν ταῖς ὑμῶν καρδίαις παρὰ τῆς  
προαιρέσεως ὑφιστάμενον σκότος καὶ νῦν κρυπτόμενον ἐν ταῖς ψυχαῖς  
ὑμῶν διαδοθήσεται τότε καὶ ἐν τοῖς σώμασιν ὑμῶν καὶ ὁ θησαυρὸς τοῦ  
ψυχικοῦ σκότους ὑμῶν φανερούμενος ἐν τοῖς σώμασιν ὑμῶν σκότος ἐξώτε-  
ρον γενήσεται ὑμῖν · *ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων*. ἐκεῖ  
320 πενήσουσιν οἱ ταῖς ἡδοναῖς τῶν ἰδίων θελημάτων ἀκολουθοῦντες · ἐκεῖ  
αἰσχυνθήσονται οἱ τὴν δόξαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων λαμβάνοντες καὶ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ  
δόξαν ἀποπεμπόμενοι. ἐκεῖ βρυχήσονται ὀδυνηρὸν οἱ τῇ κρίσει τῶν ἰδίων  
λογισμῶν πιστεύοντες καὶ ταῖς ψήφοις τῶν θείων πατέρων ἀπειθοῦντες.

**15.** Ἄλλ' ὁ μὲν πρὸς τούτους λόγος ἱκανῶς εἰρημένος ἦδη παυέσθω.  
325 ὑμεῖς δέ, ἀδελφοί μου, οἱ τῷ ζυγῷ τῆς κατὰ Χριστὸν ὑποταγῆς τοὺς ἰδίους

291 ἀπαλλάττει A εἰ deest in A 293 ἔσο: ἔστω A 294 περὶ: ἐπὶ A  
συλαγωγῶν correcti: συλλαγωγῶν BA 309 λυθήσεται A 314 ὄψεσθε A



there is no unintended circumstance hindering you from a choice directed towards your health; only your free choice is drawing upon you a sickness of your willing. If will can deliver from disease, then in turn if you will it, you shall descend to Hades. Inasmuch as you hold in the hand of your will the balance of conversion, show yourself well disposed towards the church that gave you rebirth. Do not remain a son inconsiderate towards your mother, reviling her and robbing her children with your ruinous discourses, lest in your maligning of holy things and your tearing asunder of ecclesiastical unity the last day come upon you without hope and silence your blasphemous tongue and stop the vain struggle of your soul; lest that day raise and incite thoughts to judge you, thoughts that burden your soul with shame, censure and condemnation accompanied by penalties, thoughts that separate you definitively from the Jerusalem above, the true mother of the church of the firstborn, because you dared to rend and tear apart the church below, thoughts that turn the vote against you because of your judgement and your works, meting out to you a punishment without consolation by means of a most just and condign condemnation.

14. In a fraternal spirit we set these matters before your charity, exhorting you to reconciliation with the church, our common mother. But we do not have you convinced, nor repentant, nor saved. Behold, we pity you, we weep over you, when we consider the day of misery to which you are heading. 'On that day the elements will burn up with a roaring sound and be destroyed, and the earth and all the works upon it will be consumed by fire.'<sup>26</sup> A worthless regret will come upon you, bringing with it a boundless grief and an unceasing moaning. Your works will be abolished, and your honour and your great joy will go down to Hades, because your soul will receive blessings during your lifetime and for eternity it will not see light. Rot will be strewn beneath you for a bed and worms will be your blanket. The darkness that has taken substance in your hearts as a result of your free choice and which is now concealed in your souls will then be passed on also to your bodies. And with the store of darkness in your soul made manifest in your bodies, your lot will be in the outer darkness, 'where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth.'<sup>27</sup> There will mourn those who have followed the pleasures of their own wills. There shame will cover those who accept respect from men but reject respect for God. There those who trust the judgement of their own thoughts but disobey the decrees of the divine Fathers will be painfully torn in pieces.

15. But that should be an end to my speech to these people for it is already sufficient. You, my brothers, who have thrust your own necks beneath the yoke of

<sup>26</sup> 2 Pt 3:10.

<sup>27</sup> Mt 8:12, 13:42, 50, etc.

ὑποβαλλόντες αὐχένας καὶ τὸ ἄροτρον φέροντες τῆς ἀγαθῆς ὁμονοίας καὶ εἰρήνης τὴν ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις συνεχῇ διατριβὴν μὴ παραιτήσῃ. ὥς ἂν τῇ πρὸς αὐτοὺς προσεδρεύῃ καὶ ἐπιμονῇ καὶ ἑαυτοὺς στομῶσωμεν πρὸς παροξυσμὸν ἀγάπης καὶ σχολῆς τῶν ἀγαθῶν, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων τὰ  
 330 στασιώδη καὶ ὑπερήφανα φρονήματα ὑποτέμοντες, ἐξ ἀσπάρτων σπαρτὰ παρασκευάσωμεν, ὅρεξιν αὐτοῖς ἐντιθέντες ἐκκλησιαστικῶν συνάξεων καὶ ἀκροάσεων θείων, καὶ στόμα Χριστοῦ διὰ τοῦ τρόπου τούτου γενόμενοι·  
*ὁ γὰρ ἐξάγων, φησὶν, ἄξιον ἐξ ἀναξίου ὡς στόμα μου ἔσται.*

16. Ἵνα δὲ τὸν προσόντα ὑμῖν πόθον θρέψω καὶ τὸν τόνον τῶν ψυχῶν  
 335 ὑμῶν νευρώσω, ὑπομιμνήσω ὑμᾶς καὶ τινῶν ἱστοριῶν, ὧν ἡ διήγησις παρίστησιν ἐναργῶς τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἀγανάκτησιν, ἀμυνομένην τοὺς τῶν ἱερέων καταφρονοῦντας καὶ τοῦ ἐκκλησιαστικοῦ νόμου τὰ δίκαια παρυφαρπάζοντας.

17. Κάϊν καὶ Ἄβελ ἀδελφοὶ ὄντες ἡβουλήθησαν τῷ θεῷ θυσίαν προσε-  
 340 νεγκεῖν. καὶ προσήγαγον ὁ μὲν ἐκ τῶν δευτέρων, ὁ δὲ τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τῶν θρεμμάτων αὐτοῦ. προσέσχεν οὖν ὁ θεὸς τῇ τοῦ Ἄβελ θυσίᾳ, τὴν δὲ τοῦ Κάϊν ἀπεπέμψατο. λύπη ἐπὶ τούτῳ κατέσχε τὸν Κάϊν· διὸ καὶ φθόνον ὠδινήσας ἐν καρδίᾳ φόνον ἀπέτεκε καὶ ἀδελφοκτόνος ἐγένετο. ἄρα οὖν παρεῖδεν ὁ θεὸς τὴν τοῦ Κάϊν κατὰ τοῦ ἱερέως Ἄβελ φονικὴν ἐπανάστασιν;  
 345 οὐκ ἤλεγξεν; οὐκ ἔκρινεν; οὐ κατέκρινεν; οὐχ ὑπέβαλε τὸν φονέα μέχρι τέλους ζωῆς στεναγμῷ καὶ τρόμῳ σφοδροτάτῃ; τοσαύτην καὶ γὰρ τὴν κατὰδίκην ὑπέμεινε καὶ ὑπομένει, ὅτι καὶ ζῶν τῇ ἀφορήτῳ παρεδόθη κολάσει καὶ θανὼν οὐκ ἡδυνήθη κρυβῆναι ἀπὸ τῆς μνήμης τῶν ἀνθρώπων. ταῖς γὰρ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κόσμου μέχρι τέλους γενεαῖς, ὁ αὐτὸς πρόκειται εἰς  
 350 ὄνειδος ὁμοῦ καὶ φόβον· τὸ μὲν διὰ τὴν τόλμην τῆς μαιφόνου γνώμης, τὸ δὲ διὰ τὴν ἐκδίκησιν τῆς θείας δίκης. βλέπεις τίσιν ὑπάγονται τιμωρίαις οἱ τῶν ὀρθοδόξων ἱερέων κατεπαιρόμενοι καὶ τὴν παρ' αὐτῶν μετὰ πίστεως καὶ εὐσεβείας προσφερομένην τῷ θεῷ θυσίαν μυστικὴν ἀποστρεφόμενοι;

18. Ἀβραάμ ὀπίσω τῶν ἀλλοφύλων δραμὼν καὶ διώξας καὶ τροπωσά-  
 355 μενος αὐτούς, ἐν τῷ ὑποστρέφειν προσῆλθε τῷ ἱερεῖ καὶ δεκάτας ἐκ τῶν λαφύρων αὐτῷ δέδωκε καὶ ἡὺλογήθη παρ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἄρτον καὶ οἶνον ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν αὐτοῦ ἐδέξατο· διδάσκων ἡμᾶς διὰ τοῦ κατὰ τὸν τύπον τοῦτον τρόπου, ὅτι δεῖ μετὰ τὴν φυγὴν τῆς κακίας καὶ τὴν ἀπ' αὐτῆς ἔκκλισιν ποιεῖν καὶ τὸ ἀγαθόν, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἀνατίθεσθαι τῷ θεῷ τὸν ἅπαντα σκοπὸν  
 360 ἡμῶν τῷ τελειοῦντι τὰς τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν αἰσθήσεις καὶ ἐνισχύοντι τὴν ἀσθένειαν ἡμῶν κατὰ τῶν δυναστευόντων ἡμᾶς ὁρατῶν καὶ ἀοράτων ἐχθρῶν· οὕτω γὰρ ποιοῦντες, εὐλογούμεθα παρ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἰσχύν

326 καὶ<sup>1</sup> deest in A    328 αὐτὰς προσεδρεύας A    332 γινόμενοι A    340 ὑπαρχὴν A  
 348 καὶ θανὼν οὐκ ἡδυνήθη κολάσει post κολάσει add. A

submission to Christ and who carry the plough of good concord and peace, do not refrain from regular church attendance. So that by your assiduity and steadfastness in their regard you may train yourselves to stir up love and dedication for good things, cutting out at the root the seditious and arrogant thoughts of other men, let us prepare cultivated crops from uncultivated crops, instilling within men a desire for church assemblies and hearing divine things and in this way become the mouth of Christ. For scripture says, 'He who brings forth worthiness from the unworthy shall be as my mouth.'<sup>28</sup>

16. In order that I may nurture the desire that is yours and strengthen the tone of your souls, I make mention of certain stories, the telling of which presents clearly the wrath of God that wards off those who show disregard for priests and make off with the just statutes of church law.

17. Cain and Abel were brothers who wanted to offer sacrifice to God.<sup>29</sup> One brought forward some of his second fruits, the other the first fruits of his cattle. God, therefore, attended to the sacrifice of Abel, but that of Cain he rejected. On this account, grief seized hold on Cain, and so, with the birth pains of envy in his heart, he begot murder and became a fratricide. Did God then overlook the murderous attack of Cain against the priest Abel? Did he not bring accusation? Did he not pass judgement? Did he not render a condemnation? Did he not subject the murderer to the most dreadful moaning and trembling until the end of his life? He suffered and continues to suffer so great a sentence in that, while alive, he was handed over to unbearable punishment and when he died he could not be hidden from the memory of men. For in the generations from the beginning till the end of the world he is presented as both an object of disgrace and of fear, the first because of the audacity of his murderous intent, the second because of the avenging, divine judgement. Do you see to what miseries are subjected those who disparage orthodox priests and who reject the mystic sacrifice offered by them to God with faith and piety?

18. Abraham went after the foreign tribes, pursuing and putting them to flight and upon his return he went to the priest and gave him tithes from his booty; he received a blessing from him and accepted bread and wine from his hands.<sup>30</sup> In so doing, he teaches us by means of this *typos* that after fleeing and turning aside from evil we must also do good, namely, we must dedicate all our goals to God who brings to perfection the senses of our soul and body and who strengthens our infirmity in the face of the visible and invisible enemies who lord it over us. For in so doing we are blessed by him and receive strength for virtue and knowledge.

<sup>28</sup> Jer 15:19.

<sup>29</sup> Gen 4:1-16.

<sup>30</sup> Gen 14:13-20.

ἀρετῆς καὶ γνώσεως δεχόμεθα. ἀλλ' οἱ ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τῆς συγχύσεως  
 ἀγωνισάμενοι καὶ θεία δυνάμει τῶν διωκτῶν κατισχύσαντες καὶ διαφυλα-  
 365 χθέντες, μετὰ τὴν καταστροφὴν τῆς αἰρέσεως καὶ τὴν ἀποκατάστασιν τῆς  
 ἐκκλησίας οὐκ ἀνέθηκαν τὰ ἑαυτῶν φρονήματα τῷ ἐν δυναμώσαντι  
 αὐτοὺς θεῷ, ἀλλὰ τὴν νίκην τῇ ἰδίᾳ φρονήσει καὶ δυνάμει ἐπιγραφάμενοι  
 ἀπέστησαν ἀπὸ παντὸς ἱερέως ὀρθοδοξία τηρουμένου καὶ τοὺς δι' αὐτῶν  
 370 χορηγουμένους ἁγιασμοὺς τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀπεστράφησαν καὶ τὴν μετάληψιν  
 τοῦ δεσποτικοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν οὐ δέχονται.  
 ἡ γὰρ ὑπερηφανία καταχορεύει τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτῶν, εἰς δουλείαν ἑαυτῆς  
 προδοῦσα τοὺς φανέντας ἐλευθέρους ἐκ τῆς αἰρέσεως. φαίνεται τοιγαροῦν  
 ὅτι ταῖς τῆς ἀνθρωπαρεσκείας χερσὶ βασταζόμενοι, τὴν τῆς αἰρέσεως  
 375 πυρκαϊὰν φεύγοντες ἦσαν. εἰ γὰρ ἦν αὐτοῖς κατὰ θεὸν ὁ δρόμος πρὸς τὸ  
 φυγεῖν αὐτοὺς τὸν τῆς καινοτομίας ἐμπρησμόν, ἔφευγον ἂν καὶ τὸν τῆς  
 ὑπερηφανίας καπνόν, τινὶ τρόπῳ εἰς τοῦτο ἐρχόμενοι, ταπεινούμενοι τοῖς  
 ὀρθοδόξοις ποιμέσι καὶ εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀποτρέχοντες. ἀλλ' ὥς  
 ἔοικεν, οὐκ ἀνεσώσαντο ἀπὸ τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας τῆς κενοδοξίας, ὥσπερ τινὰ  
 Λῶτ, τὸν ἑαυτῶν λογισμόν, ἀλλὰ τῇ φυγῇ τῆς αἰρέσεως ἐπαρθέντες τῇ  
 380 ἐνέδρᾳ τῆς ἀλαζονείας περιέπεσον, ἐκ τῆς ἰδιοκρισίας τὸν λιμένα ναυάγιον  
 εὕρηκότες. κρεῖττον ἦν αὐτοῖς τοῖς τῆς καινοτομίας κύμασι ῥαντισθῆναι  
 καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πεσεῖν τὴν ἰδίαν ἀσθένειαν συνιδεῖν καὶ διὰ μετανοίας ἀνα-  
 στήναι, ἢ εὐθυπλοήσαντας εἰς ὑπερηφανίας πτώμα κατενεχθῆναι καὶ  
 ἀνιάτως νοσεῖν ἐκ τοῦ μὴ τὸν νοῦν εὐεκτεῖν· ἐπειδὴ ὁ πρῶτος τρόπος  
 385 εὐλογίας καὶ μακαρισμοῦ μεστὸς ἀναφαίνεται, ὁ δὲ δεῦτερος ταλανισμοῦ  
 καὶ δακρύων ἄξιος.

19. Ἀδελφὴ Μωσέως κατὰ Μωσέως γογγύσασα λελέπρωται καὶ  
 Μωϋσῆς ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς εὐχεται καὶ ἡ πάντα ἀνύουσα εὐχὴ ἄπρακτος  
 ἐνταῦθα δείκνυται. Δαθὰν καὶ Ἀβειρῶν κατὰ τοῦ ἱερέως Ἀαρὼν ἐπανασ-  
 390 τάντες πυρίκαυστοι γεγόνασι. καὶ τοσοῦτον δῆμον ἱερέων, ἢ μᾶλλον ἱερω-  
 σύνην καὶ ἐκκλησίαν ἀθετουμένην καὶ ὕβριζομένην, ὁ τῶν ἐκδικήσεων θεὸς  
 περιόψεται; *μὴ παραζήλου ἐν τοῖς σχιζομένοις ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, μὴ δὲ*  
*ζήλου τοὺς ἀπείργοντας τὸν λαὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγιασμάτων μεταλήψεως, ὅτι*  
*ὥσει χόρτος ταχὺ ἀποξηρανθήσονται καὶ ὅτι ὥσει λάχανα χλόης ταχὺ ἀποπε-*  
 395 *σοῦνται.* οὐδὲν γὰρ χεῖρον τοῦ καταφρονεῖν ἱερέων καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας  
 ἀποδημεῖν· καὶ οὐδὲν ἄλλιν λυσιτελέστερον τοῦ προσκαρτερεῖν ἐν ταῖς

371 αὐτῶν: αὐτοῦ A      378-379 ὥσπερ τινὰ Λῶτ locus nondum sanatus      379 ἑαυτὸν  
 A      379-380 τὴν ἐνέδραν τῆς ἀλαζονείας A      381 εὕρηκότες A      αὐτοῖς: αὐ in textu  
 et τοῖς alia manu in margine additum hab. B; deest in A      390 τοσοῦτο A      394-  
 395 ὥσει...ἀποπεσοῦνται deest in A

But there are those who engaged in struggle during troubled times and who by divine power prevailed over and were preserved from those whom they pursued; after the heresy was put down and the church restored,<sup>31</sup> they did not turn their thoughts to the God who gave them such power but, attributing the victory to their own power and devising, they turned away from every priest who preserved himself in orthodoxy and they rejected the holy rites with which the the priests provide the church and they do not accept from their hands communion in the Lord's body and blood. For arrogance dances in triumph over their souls, giving over to its own slavery those who appeared to be free of heresy. Thus it seems that, born upon the hands of their desire for popularity, they fled the flames of heresy. If their race to flee the conflagration of heretical innovation had been divinely inspired, they would have fled also the smoke of pride. By some route they would have reached the point of learning humility from orthodox pastors and would have run off to the mountain of the church. But, as it seems, they were not saved from the captivity of vainglory in their own way of thinking (like some sort of Lot);<sup>32</sup> rather, buoyed up by their flight from heresy, they fell into the ambush of their boastfulness, having found the harbour to be their place of shipwreck because of their self-reliance. Better had they drowned in the waves of their heretical innovations and as a result of their fall had recognized their sickness and had risen up again through repentance—better that, than to sail straight into the ruin of pride and to have been brought down and suffer an incurable disease because the mind was not kept healthy. For the first way is shown to offer blessing and happiness, while the second merits misery and tears.

19. When the sister of Moses grumbled against Moses, she came down with leprosy and Moses prayed on her behalf and in this case prayer which accomplishes all things appears unavailing.<sup>33</sup> Dathan and Abiram rebelled against the priest, Aaron, and were consumed by fire.<sup>34</sup> Will the God who requires satisfaction overlook so great a band of priests, or rather, the rejection and slander of the priesthood and the church? Do not fret because of those who split off from the church, nor be envious of those who keep the people away from communion in the holy rites, 'for they will soon wither like the grass and quickly pass away like the green herb.'<sup>35</sup> There is nothing worse than showing disregard for priests and staying away from the church, and, in turn, there is nothing more profitable than

<sup>31</sup> i.e. the heresy involved in the Union of the Churches negotiated by Michael VIII Palaeologus and ratified at the second council of Lyons in 1274. The Arsenites fiercely opposed this policy of Unionism.

<sup>32</sup> Gen 19 (?). The sense of this allusion remains obscure. The text may be corrupt.

<sup>33</sup> Num 12.

<sup>34</sup> Num 16.

<sup>35</sup> Ps 36:1-2.

ἐκκλησίαις καὶ μετὰ πίστεως καὶ πληροφορίας τοῖς τοῦ θεοῦ ἱερεῦσι προσέρχεσθαι.

20. Καὶ ἵνα μάθῃς ὅτι οὕτως ἔχει ταῦτα, ἄκουσον καὶ ταύτης τῆς  
 400 ἱστορίας. Ὁζίας ὁ βασιλεὺς, δίκαιος ὢν καὶ κατορθώμασι πολλοῖς δια-  
 πρέπων, εἰς ἀπόνοιαν ἐξώκειλε καὶ ἐπεθύμησε τοῦ θυμιάσαι καὶ τὸ ἀνῆκον  
 ἀξίωμα τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν ἀρπάσαι. τοῦ δὲ ἱερέως εἰπόντος, *οὐκ ἔξεστί σοι,*  
*βασιλεῦ, θυμιάσαι ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἱερεῦσι τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἀαρὼν,* οὐκ ἐδέξατο τὸν  
 ἔλεγχον, ἀλλὰ καταφρονήσας αὐτοῦ εἰσῆλθεν ἐν τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ καὶ  
 405 ἐθυμίασε· καὶ εὐθέως ἡ τῆς λέπρας ἀνάδοσις γέγονεν ἐν τῷ μετώπῳ αὐτοῦ,  
 ἐλεγχούσης τὴν ἀπόνοιαν τῶν λογισμῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκάθαρτον δεικ-  
 νούσης τὸν ὡς οὐ θέμις ἀψάμενον τοῦ τῆς ἱερωσύνης δικαίου. εἶδες πῶς  
 ὁ καθαρὸς ἀκάθαρτος γέγονε διὰ τὸ περιῖδεῖν τὸν τοῦ ἱερέως ἔλεγχον καὶ  
 τῶν ἀνεφίκτων κατατολμήσαι; ἔγνως ὑπεροψίαν μὴ οὖσαν λέπραν ἀνθή-  
 410 σασαν ἐκ τοῦ τὴν ἱερωσύνην ἐνυβρισθῆναι; ὅρα καὶ ταπεινῶσιν προσοῦσαν  
 λέπραν ἀφανίσασαν ἐκ τῆς πρὸς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν σχολῆς καὶ τοῦ πρὸς τὸν  
 ἱερέα σεβάσματος.

21. Ἐν τοῖς διηγήμασι τῶν πατέρων φέρεται τι τοιοῦτον. λαϊκός τις τὸν  
 ἱερέα τῆς ἐκκλησίας εἰς ἣν εἰώθει σχολάζων εἶδεν αὐτοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς  
 415 μοιχείας ἀλόντα ἐγκλήματι. οὐ καὶ τῇ ἐπαύριον τὴν ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν  
 τετελεκότος, προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ μετὰ πίστεως καὶ πληροφορίας ἐκ τῶν  
 χειρῶν αὐτοῦ μετασχεῖν τοῦ ἁγίου δώρου. μετὰ δὲ τὸ λαβεῖν ῥήτησατο καὶ  
 σφραγίσαι αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ μετώπῳ ἐν ᾧ ἐπεπόλαζεν ἡ λέπρα. τοῦ δὲ σφρα-  
 γίδα ποιησαμένου, ἡ μὲν λέπρα ὥσει λεπίς ἐξέπιπτε, τὸ δὲ μέλος ὑγιὲς καὶ  
 420 καθαρὸν κατεφαίνετο—θαῦμα ὄντως φοβερὸν καὶ θείου κρίματος ἔμπλεον.

22. Οὐκ ἥργησεν ἡ ἀμαρτία τὴν χάριν, ἵνα μὴ χώραν ἔξει ἡ κατὰ τῶν  
 ἱερέων κρίσις παρὰ τοῦ βουλομένου παντός, ἀλλ' ἐνήργησεν ἡ χάρις διὰ  
 τὴν ἀξίαν τῆς ἱερωσύνης, ἵνα παιδευθῶμεν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, ὅτι ὅτε προσερχό-  
 μεθα τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν, οὐκέτι ἀνθρώποις ἀλλὰ τῷ θεῷ προσερχόμεθα τῷ δι'  
 425 αὐτῶν παρέχοντι ἡμῖν τὰς δωρεὰς καὶ ἀγιάζοντι ἡμᾶς· καὶ ὅτι ὁ μετὰ  
 πίστεως προσερχόμενος τυγχάνει τοῦ ποθουμένου καὶ οὔτε λυμáινεται τὴν  
 αὐτοῦ πίστιν τὸ τοῦ ἱερέως ἐλάττωμα, οὔτε πάλιν ὁ ὑψηλὸς τοῦ ἱερέως βίος  
 ὠφελεῖ τὸν ἀπιστίᾳ συνεχόμενον. ὁ ἱερεὺς καθὼς ἄνθρωπος καὶ ἀσθένειαν  
 περικείμενος οὐ δύναται σε ὠφελῆσαι, ὡς οὐδὲ σὺ πάλιν αὐτὸν ἄτε δὴ τῆς  
 430 ἴσης ἀσθενείας μετέχειν· ἄνθρωπος γὰρ ἄνθρωπον ὠφελῆσαι οὐ δύναται,  
 ἀλλ' ὁ ἱερεὺς τὴν ἀξίαν τῆς ἱερωσύνης ἔχων οἰκιοῦται τῇ χάριτι· δῶρον

402 σοι deest in A      405 ἐθυμίασε correxi: ἐθυμιάσαι B, ἐθυσίασε A,      μετώπῳ  
 correxi: μετόπῳ BA      414 αὐτῷ A      418 μετώπῳ correxi: μετόπῳ BA      ἐπεπέλαζεν  
 A      422 τοῦ deest in A      428 ἀπιστίαν A      ὁ ante ἄνθρωπος add. A      430 με-  
 τέχων A

assiduous attendance at church and approaching the priests of God with faith and firm assurance.

20. That you may learn that this is indeed the case, listen to the following story.<sup>36</sup> King Ozias, a just man eminent in his many achievements, drifted into folly and wanted to offer sacrifice and to arrogate to himself the rank that belonged to priests. But when the priest said to him, 'It is not permitted to you, my King, to offer sacrifice, but rather it is for the priests, who are the sons of Aaron',<sup>37</sup> he did not accept the reproof, but, disregarding it, entered the altar place and offered sacrifice. Immediately leprosy broke out on his forehead, proving the madness of his thoughts and showing the impurity of one who unlawfully lays hold of the rights of the priesthood.<sup>38</sup> Do you see how a pure man became impure because he disregarded the priest's reproof and intruded presumptuously upon the inaccessible? Do you not recognize the contempt which is a leprosy that flourishes upon mockery of the priesthood? Note also that the presence of humility can wipe away leprosy because of attendance at church and reverence for the priest.

21. An incident something like the following is found in the stories of the Fathers.<sup>39</sup> A certain layman with his own eyes saw the priest of the church which he usually attended caught in the crime of adultery. Whereupon the next morning, when the priest had offered the unbloody sacrifice, he approached him with faith and full assurance to partake of the holy gift at his hands. After receiving communion, he asked if he could make the sign of the cross on the priest's forehead where leprosy was spreading. When the sign of the cross was made the leprosy fell off like flakes and his face appeared healthy and clean—truly a fearsome wonder full of divine judgement.

22. Sin does not render grace ineffectual, lest there be occasion for judgement against priests from whoever wishes to lodge one; rather grace operates for the sake of the worthiness of the priesthood, so that men may learn that when we approach priests we no longer approach men but God, who through them provides us with his gifts and sanctifies us. And further, grace so operates that we may learn that the man who approaches in faith attains the object of his desire, and neither does the deficiency of the priest damage his faith, nor in turn does the noble conduct of the priest do any good for the man who is constrained by unbelief. As a man, subject to weakness, the priest is unable to do you any good, as you in turn are unable to do him any good inasmuch as you share the same weakness. No man

<sup>36</sup> 2 Chr 26. John Cheilas cites some texts of John Chrysostom which treat the Ozias story (*Against the Arsenites* 3.3 [370-71]).

<sup>37</sup> 2 Chr 26:18.

<sup>38</sup> 2 Chr 26.19.

<sup>39</sup> I have not been able to find this story in any of the standard collections: viz., the *Apophthegmata Patrum*, Palladius, the *Historia monachorum in Aegypto*, the *Evergetinon*, or the *Pandects* of Nikon of the Black Mountain.

γὰρ αὕτη θεοῦ καὶ δι' αὐτῆς τῷ θεῷ πλησιάζει. ὀφείλεις γοῦν καὶ σὺ τὸ  
 παρ' ἑαυτοῦ προσενεγκεῖν· τὸ δέ ἐστιν, ὑποτάσσεσθαι τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ  
 μετὰ πίστεως προσέρχεσθαι τοῖς ὀρθοδόξοις ἱερεῦσι, καὶ διὰ τῆς κατὰ τὴν  
 435 ἐκκλησίαν διατριβῆς καὶ τῆς ἐν σοὶ πρὸς τὰ θεῖα πίστεως καὶ τῆς πρὸς τοὺς  
 ἱερεῖς τιμῆς γνώμην προσλαμβάνεις ἀρεσκομένην τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι. τότε  
 ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ χάρις ἡ διὰ τὴν ἀξίαν τῆς ἱερωσύνης τῷ ἱερεῖ παραμένουσα,  
 ὁρῶσα τῆς διανοίας σου τὴν πίστιν καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς σου τὴν ταπείνωσιν καὶ  
 ἀποδεχομένη τὴν ἐτοιμασίαν τῆς καρδίας σου διὰ τὴν τῆς γνώμης  
 440 οἰκειότητα, εἰσέρχεται ἐν σοὶ δι' ὧν ἐπιλέγει καὶ δωρεῖται σοὶ ὁ ἱερεὺς, καὶ  
 πληροῖ πάντα τὰ αἰτήματα ὅσα συμφέρει τῇ ψυχῇ σου.

23. Κατανόησον σεαυτὸν καὶ εὐρήσεις, ὅτι μέρος τῆς σῆς ψυχῆς  
 δουλεύει τῷ θεῷ καὶ μέρος πάλιν αὐτῆς δουλεύει τῇ κακίᾳ· καὶ οὐκ  
 ἀποστρέφεται σε ὁ θεὸς καθ' ὃ μέρος δουλεύεις αὐτῷ διὰ τὴν κατὰ τὸ  
 445 λοιπὸν σου μέρος ἀδιαφορίαν· οὐδὲ πάλιν παραβλέπει τὴν σὴν ὑπεροφίαν  
 διὰ τὴν ἐν ἄλλοις σου ὑπακοήν. ἀλλὰ καθόσον παρέξεις τῷ θεῷ τὴν σὴν  
 προαίρεσιν, κατὰ τοσοῦτον ἡ χάρις ἀντιλαμβάνεται σου, παρέχουσά σοι  
 τὸν μισθὸν τῆς δουλείας. καὶ καθόσον πάλιν ἐκουσίως ἐκκλίνεις ἀπὸ θεοῦ,  
 καὶ ὁ χωρισμὸς τῆς χάριτος ἐν σοὶ γίνεται· κολάζων γὰρ τὸ ἀκόλαστον τοῦ  
 450 ἀνυποτάκτου φρονήματος.

24. Τοῦτο καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἱερέως φρόνει, ὅτι ὁ θεὸς διὰ μὲν τὴν ἀξίαν τῆς  
 ἱερωσύνης ἐνεργεῖ δι' αὐτοῦ, διὰ δὲ τὴν ἀμέλειαν τοῦ βίου αὐτοῦ κρίνει  
 αὐτὸν ἐν καιρῷ λογοθεσίου· ἡ γὰρ κρίσις αὐτοῦ ἐστὶ, κριθήσεται δὲ ὅτι οὐκ  
 ἄξιον βίον ἐπεδείξατο τῆς δοθείσης αὐτῷ ἀξίας. τίς ὁ δεδωκὼς αὐτῷ τὴν  
 455 χάριν τῆς ἱερωσύνης; σὺ ἢ ὁ θεός; εἰ μὲν σὸν δῶρόν ἐστιν ἡ ἱερωσύνη, καλῶς  
 κρίνεις τὸν ἱερέα· εἰ δὲ θεὸς ἐστιν ὁ δωρούμενος αὐτῷ τὴν χάριν, αὐτὸς  
 πάντως ἀποδώσει καὶ τὰς εὐθύνas τοῦ βίου αὐτοῦ. σὺ οὖν τί κρίνεις  
*ἀλλότριον οἰκέτην; τῷ ἰδίῳ κυρίῳ στήκει ἢ πίπτει.*

25. Εἰ μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱερέως φεύγεις, ὥς μὴ ὀρθῶς φρονούντος περὶ τῶν  
 460 τῆς πίστεως δογμάτων ἀλλ' ὑπὸ αἵρεσιν ἀλισκομένου, καλῶς ποιεῖς. καὶ  
 δεῖξον πρῶτον τοῦτο καὶ δέχομαι καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ χάριτας ὁμολογῶ. ἕως δ'  
 ἂν μοι τοῦτο δεικνύης, οὐδὲν ἐξ ὧν προφασίζῃ προφάσεων βοηθῇ πρὸς  
 ματαιότητα τῆς σῆς ὑπεροφίας. ὦ τοῦ θαύματος. ὁ καθαρὸς θεὸς παρορῶν  
 ἀμαρτίας οἰκεῖ ἐν τοῖς ἱερεῦσι διὰ τὴν ἀξίαν τῆς ἱερωσύνης καὶ ἐκδέχεται  
 465 τοὺς ἀνθρώπους προσέρχεσθαι αὐτοῖς πρὸς τὸ ἁγιάζειν καὶ ζωοποιεῖν  
 αὐτοὺς διὰ τούτων καὶ περιορᾷ τὰ ἐλαττώματα τοῦ ἱερέως διὰ τὴν

440 ὁ ἱερεὺς deest in A      450 ἀνυποστάκτου σου A      ad 451 ὅρα περὶ ἱερέων ἀξίων  
 καὶ ἀναξίων notauit in margine ext. B (fol. 108r)      453 δὲ deest in A



is able to do good for another man, but the priest, because he possesses the dignity of the priesthood, is familiar with grace, for grace is a gift of God and through it he draws near to God. Thus, you too have an obligation regarding the offering on your part, namely, to be subject to the church and to approach orthodox priests with faith; further, through assiduous attendance at church and through your faith towards divine things and respect for priests you are to assume an attitude pleasing to the Holy Spirit. Then, the grace of God which abides in the priest on account of the dignity of the priesthood, perceiving the faith present in your mind and the humility in your soul and accepting the readiness of heart which you have achieved by conforming your mind [to divine things], shall enter within you through what the priest says and gives to you, and the grace of God shall fulfil all the requests of your soul.<sup>40</sup>

23. Examine yourself and you will find that a part of your soul serves God and, in turn, a part of it serves evil. God does not reject that part of you which serves him because of that part which is indifferent. Nor, in turn, does he overlook your contempt for the sake of the obedience in the rest of you. Rather, to the extent that you offer God your free will, grace shall come to your assistance, granting you the reward for your service. And, conversely, to the extent that you willingly turn from God, there shall be a parting from grace within you, for he punishes unbridled disobedience of thought.

24. With regard to the priest, take the following into consideration. For the sake of the dignity of the priesthood God works through him, but on account of the carelessness of his life he judges him at the time of accounting, for judgement belongs to God. But the priest will be judged because he did not manifest a life worthy of the dignity given to him. Who has given to him the grace of priesthood? You or God? If the priesthood is your gift, rightly do you judge the priest; if God is the one who grants him the grace, certainly he himself will take an accounting of his life. 'You then, why do you pass judgement on the servant of another? It is before his own master that he stands or falls.'<sup>41</sup>

25. If you flee from the priest because his opinions concerning the doctrines of the faith are incorrect and he is caught up in heresy, you act rightly. But first prove it and I too will accept it and give thanks. But until you have proved this, none of the excuses you proffer can support the vanity of your contempt. What

<sup>40</sup> The monk Kallistos, another writer on the Arsenite controversy, expressed similar views in his *Letter to Manuel Disypatos*: ὅτι δὲ ἐν τοῖς ἀναξίοις ἱερεῦσι καὶ ἀρχιερεῦσιν ἡ χάρις ἐνεργεῖ, δηλοῦσι μὲν καὶ ἄλλα πολλά...[after a citation from Chrysostom he concludes:] ταῦτα λέγει, ἵνα μὴ τις τὸν βίον περιεργαζόμενος τοῦ ἱερέως σκανδαλίζεται περὶ τὰ τελούμενα· οὐδὲ γὰρ τὰ τελούμενα ἄνθρωπος προσάγει, ἀλλὰ τὸ πᾶν τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ δυνάμεως ἔργον ἐστίν, κάκεινός ἐστιν ἡμᾶς ὁ μυσταγωγῶν (ed. Sykoutres, *Ἑλληνικά* 3 [1930] 25.16-27)). Cf. John Cheilas, *Against the Arsenites* 2.8 (364-65).

<sup>41</sup> Rom 14:4.

ὠφέλειαν τῶν προσερχομένων. οἱ δὲ ἁμαρτίαις ὑπεύθυνοι ἄνθρωποι, διὰ τὴν νομιζομένην ἢ οὖσαν ῥαθυμίαν τοῦ ἱερέως ἀποστρέφονται τὴν χάριν τοῦ σώζοντος αὐτοὺς θεοῦ καὶ φεύγουσιν ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ, καὶ  
 470 καταλιμπάνουσι τὰς ἐκκλησίας ὡς κοινούς οἴκους καὶ διατρίβουσιν ἐν ἀγοραῖς, ἐν θεάτροις, ἐν πανηγύρεσιν, ἐν καπηλείοις καὶ ἄλλοις πᾶσι πονηροῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασι. καὶ εἰ ποτέ τις ἄνθρωπος τὸν θεὸν φοβούμενος, ἐρωτήσει αὐτούς, ποῦ ἐστίν, ἀδελφοί, ἡ ἐκκλησία; ποῦ ἐστὶν ὁ ἁγιασμός; εὐθὺς ζῆλον ὑποκρίνονται καὶ ἀκρίβειαν σχηματίζονται καὶ ὡς θηρία κατ'  
 475 αὐτοῦ ἐπέρχονται, ἐπιθυμοῦντες ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτῶν διαρρῆξαι τὰς σάρκας αὐτοῦ.

26. Φρίξατε οἱ νοῦν ἔχοντες. στενάξατε οἱ λογισμοῦ μέτοχοι. θρηνήσατε οἱ αἴσθησιν καρδίας φέροντες καὶ δακρύσατε οἱ συμπαθῇ καὶ φιλάνθρωπον ψυχὴν πεπλουτηκότες καὶ παρακαλέσατε ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν τὸν  
 480 κύριον· κατορθωθήσεται δὲ ἐν ὑμῖν τοῦτο, ᾧ φιλόθεον καὶ φιλάδελφον σύστημα, ἐὰν συνεχῶς ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις ἀπαντῶμεν· ἐκεῖσε γὰρ ὀρθρίζοντες καὶ ἑαυτῶν ἀσφάλειαν ἐξαιτούμεθα κάκεινων μνείαν ἐν ταῖς ἀναφερομέναις εὐχαῖς ποιούμεθα. ἔσται δὲ πάλιν καὶ τοῦτο προθύμως τελούμενον, ἐὰν ὅπου διάγωμεν τὴν μνήμην τῆς ἀκροάσεως ἐν καρδίᾳ  
 485 φέρωμεν. *εἰ ἐμνημόνευόν σου*, φησὶ γάρ, *ἐπὶ τῆς στρωμνῆς μου, ἐν τοῖς ὄρθροις ἐμελέτων εἰς σέ*. ἄτοπον καὶ γὰρ μὴδὲ τοσαύτην ἐπιδείκνυσθαι σπουδὴν περὶ τὴν σχολὴν τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ τὴν μνήμην τῆς ἀκροάσεως, ὅσῃ οἱ ἔμποροι περὶ τὰς κοσμικὰς πανηγύρεις. ἐκεῖνοι γὰρ τῶν ἡμερῶν τὴν μνήμην ἐν αἷς συνίστανται ἐν ἑαυτοῖς θησαυρίζοντες, ἡνίκα ὁ τῆς ἀπαντήσεως αὐτῶν  
 490 καιρὸς ἐπιστῇ, τῆς οἰκίας ἀναχωροῦντες καὶ ὁδοιπορίας ἀπτόμενοι, πρὸς τὴν πανήγυριν ἀποτρέχουσι. καὶ πολλὴν ἂν ἴδοι τις ἐκεῖ τὸν ἀγῶνα τῶν σκηνῶν πηγνυμένων. καὶ οἱ μὲν τοὺς ἐπισημοτέρους προκατέλαβον τόπους, οἱ δὲ καὶ μισθοὺς πολλὰκις ἔδωκαν ὑπὲρ τούτου τοῖς δυναμένοις προφθάσαι. καὶ οὕτω τὴν τῶν πραγμάτων ἐμπορείαν ποιούμενοι, τὴν ἑαυτῶν  
 495 χρεῖαν παραμυθοῦνται.

27. Τοῦτο δὴ καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτης τῆς κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν πανηγύρεως ποιήσατε. πάντες πασῶν τῶν ὠφειλομένων συνάξεων τὴν μνήμην ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ κατέχωμεν καὶ συντρέχωμεν, ἐκ νυκτὸς ὀρθρίζοντες πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καὶ τὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας πληροῦντες ἔδαφος. πῶς γὰρ οὐκ ἄτοπον ὑπὲρ τοῦ  
 500 τὸ σωματικὸν μὲν κέρδος εὐρεῖν πάντα ποιεῖν καὶ πράττειν, τὸ δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς κέρδος ὥσπερ τινὰ ζημίαν παραιτεῖσθαι, ἀσυγκρίτως τιμιώτερον ὢν ἐκείνου, ὅτι τὸ μὲν παρέρχεται, τὸ δὲ παραμένει; ἡ κοσμικὴ πανήγυρις διαφόρους δεχομένη πολίτας μιᾷς πληθύος ὁμάδα συνίστησι· καὶ ἡ

marvel! God who is pure overlooks sin and makes his abode in priests for the sake of the dignity of the priesthood and allows men to approach them in order to sanctify and give them life thereby; he disregards the faults of the priest for the sake of the good of those who approach him. Because of the real or imagined laxity of the priest, men, liable for their sins, turn away from the grace of the God who saves them, flee from his house, abandon the churches as ordinary houses and spend their time in the markets, the theatres, fairs, taverns and any other place of ill repute. And if any God-fearing man ever asks them, 'Brothers, where is the church? Where are the holy rites?', they immediately feign zeal and put on a show of orthodoxy. Then, like wild beasts, they set upon him, desiring to tear his flesh apart with their own hands.

26. Tremble, you who have sense. Moan, you who have any share in reason. Mourn, you who have sensitivity of heart. And weep, you who have enjoyed the riches of a sympathetic and philanthropic soul and beseech the Lord on their behalf. This will find a successful fulfilment within us, my God-loving and charitable people, if our attendance at church is faithful. For there, as we celebrate the morning office, we ask for our own safety and remember them as well in the prayers we offer. This too will be readily brought to pass in turn if, wherever we are, we bear the memory of what we have heard in our hearts. For scripture says, 'If I were to remember you upon my bed, I would meditate upon you in the morning hours.'<sup>42</sup> It is absurd not to show as much eagerness for church attendance and for remembering what was heard there as merchants do for their secular fairs. For treasuring within themselves the memory of the days on which their gatherings are held, when the time for their meeting comes, they leave their homes, set out on the way and rush off to the fair. And anyone might observe the great struggle for the tents pitched there. Some try to make first claim on the more conspicuous sites, while others frequently offer bribes for the man who can get the best of the authorities. And in conducting their commerce in this way, they promote their own business.

27. Now you too should do this on the occasion of this feast of the church. Let us all hold to the memory of all the church assemblies that offer us benefit and let us gather together beforehand to keep vigil through the night till morning and fill the floor of the church. How is it not absurd to do and to practise everything in order to find bodily benefit, but to disregard the benefit of the soul like some bad bargain? For the latter is incomparably more dear than the former, because the former passes away while the latter endures. Though the secular fair receives people from different cities it brings them together in a whole comprising a single crowd;

<sup>42</sup> Ps 62:7.

ἐκκλησιαστικῇ πανήγυρις, ἀγγέλους καὶ ἀνθρώπους συνάγουσα, μίαν  
 505 ποίμνην ἀποτελεῖ ἀγγέλων καὶ ἀνθρώπων καὶ μίαν ἐκκλησίαν δεικνύει τὸν  
 οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν. ἐν ἐκείνῃ μὲν προβάλλονται τὰ πράγματα τοῦ  
 φθειρομένου βίου · ἐν ταύτῃ δὲ ἀναγινώσκονται αἱ πράξεις καὶ τὰ μαρτύ-  
 ρια καὶ οἱ βίοι πάντων τῶν ἁγίων καὶ ἐκ τῶν προβαλλομένων ἀνα-  
 γνωσμάτων ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ φωτιζόμενοι τὰς ψυχὰς καὶ εἰς ὄρεξιν ἐρχόμε-  
 510 νοι πραγματεύεσθαι τὴν μίμνησιν τῶν ἀρετῶν, κινουμέν τὴν διάνοιαν ἡμῶν  
 εἰς τὴν μελέτην τῶν ἀρίστων κατορθωμάτων. καὶ ὁ μὲν διεγείρεται πρὸς  
 δικαιοσύνην, ὁ δὲ πρὸς ἐλεημοσύνην, ὁ δὲ πρὸς σωφροσύνην καὶ ἄλλος  
 ἄλλην τῶν ἀρετῶν ἀσπάζεται · καὶ οὕτως τὰ συναλλάγματα μέσον ἡμῶν  
 καὶ τῶν ἀγγέλων γίνονται. διὰ γὰρ τῆς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ παραμονῆς καὶ τῆς  
 515 ἀκροάσεως τῶν θείων τὴν προαίρεσιν ἡμῶν στρέφοντες εἰς ὄρεξιν τῶν  
 ἀγαθῶν, εὐθὺς οἱ ἅγιοι ἄγγελοι κινουσιν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν τοὺς  
 λογισμοὺς καὶ τοὺς τρόπους τῶν καλῶν καὶ τῆς πρὸς θεὸν ἡμῶν καταλ-  
 λαγῆς μεσίται ταχίνοι γίνονται · ὅς καὶ ταῖς πρεσβείαις αὐτῶν καμπτόμε-  
 νος, δωρεῖται ἡμῖν τὰς ἐπουρανίους σκηνάς τὰς μηδέποτε καταλυομένας,  
 520 ὧν γένοιτο πάντας ἡμᾶς ἐπιτυχεῖν χάριτι καὶ φιλανθρωπίᾳ τοῦ κυρίου  
 ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ᾧ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.  
 Ἀμήν.

512 ἐλεημοσύνην et σωφροσύνην transp. A

521 τῶν αἰώνων deest in A

the church's festival brings together angels and men and creates a single flock of angels and men, revealing heaven and earth as the one church. In the former festival the goods of this perishable life are proffered, but at the latter are read the deeds, the testimonies and the lives of all the saints, and from the readings offered in the church we receive illumination for our souls, and in reaching the desire to imitate their virtues we move our minds to meditate on the finest attainments. And one man is stirred to righteousness, another to mercy, another to chastity and each man salutes one or other of the virtues. And so we have commerce between ourselves and the angels. For when we turn our free will towards desire for good things through assiduity in church and listening to divine things, the holy angels immediately move in our hearts thoughts and tendencies for things that are good and themselves become swift intermediaries for our reconciliation with God who bows to their entreaties and grants us heavenly tents that can never be destroyed. May we all attain these by the grace and philanthropy of our Lord Jesus Christ to whom be glory and power forever and ever. Amen.

THIRTEENTH-CENTURY TEACHING  
ON SPEECH AND ACCENTUATION:  
ROBERT KILWARDBY'S COMMENTARY ON *DE ACCENTIBUS*  
OF PSEUDO-PRISCIAN\*

(†) P. Osmund Lewry, O.P.

THE past fifty years have seen a remarkable revival of interest in the linguistic arts of the trivium. Contemporary interest in logic and semantics has stimulated historical research, which is recovering significant developments from the twelfth to the fifteenth century. Modern preoccupations with communication, literary form and style have begun to prompt the retrieval of lost chapters in the history of rhetoric in the Middle Ages. Following the rise of linguistics, medieval speculative grammar has also attracted some attention. It was not surprising that the *modistae* of late thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century Paris should claim particular attention for their systematic efforts to construct a treatment of grammar in which modes of signification would have their parallels in modes of understanding and being, reflecting isomorphous structures of expression, thought and reality.<sup>1</sup> However, modist grammar, interesting as it is, was a passing phase, and the pre-modist speculative grammarians, who laid the foundations of university teaching in the arts faculties and had an enduring influence there, are deserving of more attention than they have yet received.

Charles Thurot's extensive gleanings from the grammatical manuscripts of Paris, Orléans and Montpellier, published more than a century ago, gave prominence to

\* P. Osmund Lewry, O.P. died 23 April 1987. Proofs of his article were read by his colleagues at the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies.

Grateful acknowledgement of permission to use ms. Cambridge, Peterhouse 191 for the edition of the Latin text below is made to the Master and Fellows of Peterhouse.

<sup>1</sup> A recent survey of the work of the *modistae* is I. Rosier, *La grammaire spéculative des Modistes* (Publications de l'Université de Lille, III. Linguistique; Lille, 1983). Earlier studies of importance are: J. Pinborg, *Die Entwicklung der Sprachtheorie im Mittelalter* (BGPTM 42.2; Münster i. W.-Copenhagen, 1967), with a useful 'Repertorium modistischer Texte' (pp. 309-23) and an appendix devoted to pre-modist grammatical texts (pp. 323-27); G. L. Bursill-Hall, *Speculative Grammars of the Middle Ages. The Doctrine of partes orationis of the Modistae* (Approaches to Semiotics 11; The Hague, 1971). A select bibliography of medieval grammar is included with R. W. Hunt, *The History of Grammar in the Middle Ages. Collected Papers*, ed. G. L. Bursill-Hall (Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science, Series 3. Studies in the History of Linguistics 5; Amsterdam, 1980), pp. xxvii-xxxvi. For corrigenda to these papers see M. T. Gibson and S. P. Hall, eds., 'R. W. Hunt, *The History of Grammar in the Middle Ages: Additions and Corrections*', *Bodleian Library Record* 11 (1982) 9-19.

one name that is slowly receiving the credit it deserves.<sup>2</sup> Robert Kilwardby, an English master from Yorkshire, taught in the faculty of arts at Paris c. 1238-c. 1245. His commentaries survive on almost all the texts of logic taught at that time and all that was then known of Aristotle's *Nichomachean Ethics*, books 1-3.<sup>3</sup> He also made a solid contribution in the teaching of grammar. A commentary on *Priscianus maior* (books 1-16 of Priscian's *Institutiones grammaticae*), preserved in three Cambridge manuscripts and partially edited in 1975,<sup>4</sup> has been thought to be his work, but it displays some features that are uncharacteristic of Kilwardby, including an argument that seems to presuppose the unicity of form,<sup>5</sup> a doctrine vehemently rejected in the condemnations he promoted at Oxford in 1277. In 1938 S. Harrison Thomson gave a brief account of three other grammatical expositions, commentaries on *Priscianus minor* (books 17 and 18 of the *Institutiones*), the *Barbarismus* (book 3 of the *Ars maior*) of Donatus and Pseudo-Priscian *De accentibus*.<sup>6</sup> The commentary on *Priscianus minor*, preserved as a whole or in part in fourteen manuscripts and as yet unedited,<sup>7</sup> is the best attested grammatical work of Kilwardby and one which may serve as a touchstone for judging the authenticity of other material attributed to him. The commentary on Donatus was edited in 1984 by Lorenz Schmücker<sup>8</sup> from the two manuscripts

<sup>2</sup> C. Thurot, *Extraits de divers manuscrits latins pour servir à l'histoire des doctrines grammaticales au moyen âge* (Paris, 1869; rpt. Frankfurt am Main, 1964). For Robert Kilwardby see the entries indexed there, p. 562.

<sup>3</sup> For an account of these writings of Kilwardby see: P. O. Lewry, 'Robert Kilwardby on Meaning: A Parisian Course on the *Logica vetus*' in A. Zimmermann, ed., *Sprache und Erkenntnis im Mittelalter* (Miscellanea mediaevalia 13.1; Berlin-New York, 1981), pp. 376-84; idem, 'Robertus Anglicus and the Italian Kilwardby' in A. Maierù, ed., *English Logic in Italy in the 14th and 15th Centuries. Acts of the 5th European Symposium on Medieval Logic and Semantics. Rome, 10-14 November 1980* (History of Logic 1; Naples, 1982), pp. 33-51; idem, 'Robert Kilwardby's Commentary on the *Ethica nova* and *vetus*' in C. Wenin, ed., *L'homme et son univers au Moyen Age 2* (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1986), pp. 799-807. A useful bibliography on this master will be found in A. G. Judy, ed., *Robert Kilwardby O.P. De ortu scientiarum* (Auctores Britannici Medii Aevi 4; London-Toronto, 1976), pp. 250-52.

<sup>4</sup> K. M. Fredborg, N. J. Green-Pedersen, L. Nielsen and J. Pinborg, eds., *The Commentary on Priscianus maior Ascribed to Robert Kilwardby* (Cahiers de l'Institut du Moyen-Age Grec et Latin, Université de Copenhague 15; Copenhagen, 1975).

<sup>5</sup> See P. O. Lewry, 'The Problem of the Authorship', *ibid.*, 12+17+; and *Roberti Kilwardby quod fertur Commentii super Priscianum maiorem extracta* 2.1.13 (*ibid.*, p. 80): '... si significatio esset forma dictionis, cum unius formabilis sit una forma tantum, tunc una vox unam haberet significationem tantum. Nunc autem videmus contrarium.' The commentator replies, still supposing the unicity of form (*ibid.*): 'Ad primum obiectum patet solutio, quia unius formabilis una est forma substantialis, tamen possunt esse multae accidentales.'

<sup>6</sup> S. H. Thomson, 'Robert Kilwardby's Commentaries In *Priscianum* and In *Barbarismus Donati*', *The New Scholasticism* 12 (1938) 52-65.

<sup>7</sup> For a listing of the manuscripts see G. L. Bursill-Hall, *A Census of Medieval Latin Grammatical Manuscripts* (Grammatica speculativa 4; Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt, 1981), nos. 24.9, 50.7.2, 90.98, 164.10, 192.5, 197.6, 197.9.1, 208.167, 208.249, 225.52.1, 288.103.3, 288.177.1, 299.41.

<sup>8</sup> L. Schmücker, ed., *Robertus Kilwardby O.P. In Donati Artem maiorem III* (Brixen, 1984).

preserved at Cambridge and in the Vatican and previously described in Thomson's study. These two manuscripts also contain the only known copies of Kilwardby's commentary on Pseudo-Priscian *De accentibus*, which is edited below.

# I

Cambridge, Peterhouse 191 (= C) is a parchment codex of the second half of the thirteenth century, 290 × 180 mm., with 282 folios, written in double columns of 60 lines in more than one fine bookhand, probably English, and with flourished pen decorations.<sup>9</sup> Section III is the final section of the three separately foliated divisions of this codex, the first of which contains what has been thought to be Kilwardby on *Priscianus maior* (I, fols. 1ra-111vb), and the second, the authentic Kilwardby on *Priscianus minor* (II, fols. 1ra-118vb). Section III comprises the following items:

- (1) fols. 1ra-21vb: Robert Kilwardby, commentary on the *Barbarismus Donati*
- (2) fols. 22ra-29vb: Robert Kilwardby, commentary on Pseudo-Priscian *De accentibus*, *inc. prol.* 'Accidencia ut dicit Aristotiles in libro de anima conferunt maximam partem cognicionis eius quod quid est'; *inc. exp.* (22rb) 'Littera est nota elementi etc. Iste liber totus prima diuisione diuiditur in duas partes ...'; *expl.* '... per artem tenet interiectio accentum in fine uel in loco proximo ipsi fini. Explicit.'
- (3) fols. 30ra-50vb: Roger Bacon, *Summa gramatica*<sup>10</sup>
- (4) fols. 51ra-52vb: an anonymous question on figurative expressions, *inc.* 'Queritur de oracionibus figuratiuis ubi primo sciendum ...'; *expl.* '... hec de figuratiuis causa breuitatis sufficiant.'
- (5) fol. 53ra-va: John of Spain, dedicatory letter to the translation of the *Secretum secretorum*.<sup>11</sup>

Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Chigi L. V. 159<sup>12</sup> (= V) is a parchment codex of the late thirteenth century, 235 × 205 mm., with 109 folios, written in double columns of 54-74 (in the *De accentibus* commentary, 64) lines in a cursive North Italian hand, with little decoration. It contains the following items:

- (1) fols. 1ra-91vb: Robert Kilwardby, commentary on *Priscianus minor*
- (2) fols. 92ra-104va: Robert Kilwardby, commentary on the *Barbarismus Donati*

<sup>9</sup> The manuscript is described by M. R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts of the Library of Peterhouse* (Cambridge, 1899), pp. 222-23, and noted by Thomson, 'Robert Kilwardby's Commentaries', 54 and 61 n. 14.

<sup>10</sup> Ed. R. Steele (Opera hactenus inedita fratris Rogeri Baconi 15; Oxford, 1940), pp. 1-190.

<sup>11</sup> See R. Steele, ed., *Secretum secretorum cum glossis et notulis ... fratris Rogeri* (Opera hactenus inedita fratris Rogeri Baconi 5; Oxford, 1920), pp. xvii-xviii.

<sup>12</sup> This manuscript is described by Thomson, 'Robert Kilwardby's Commentaries', 55-65, with extracts from Kilwardby's commentaries.



- (3) fols. 104vb-109vb: Robert Kilwardby, commentary on Pseudo-Priscian *De accentibus, inc. prol.* 'Accidencia ut dicit Aristotiles in libro de anima cognicionis eius quod quid est'; *inc. exp.* 'Littera est nota elementi etc. Iste liber diuiditur in duas partes ...'; *expl.* '... secundum artem tenet interiectio accentum in fine uel in loco proximo ipsi fini. Expliciunt notule libri barbarismi et accentus, et ideo laus in terminatione operis deo referatur, quia omnis laus in fine canitur.'

The commentary on *De accentibus* is without ascription in C. The work is simply identified by the headline in alternating red and blue capitals, 'L DE ACCENTIBUS'. A list of contents, on the inside cover, facing the first recto of section I, begins in a seventeenth-century hand, 'Priscianus Gram. in majori, Donatus de Barbarismo', and has been continued in another hand 'et Liber de accidentibus uel ut credo de accentibus, R. Bacon Summa de Grammatica, Tract. De Orationibus figuratis'. A further addition at the side notes 'librum Prisciani minorem Kilwarby super primum', following, no doubt, the information in the colophon on fol. 76v of section II, 'Expliciunt notule Kilwarby super primum librum Prisciani minoris'. In V the conclusion of the *De accentibus* commentary is followed after five lines by an inscription in a bold Italian hand of the fourteenth century (over an erasure), 'In hoc volumine continetur scriptum super Priscianum'. After a further line, in a hand which may be that of the copyist of the text itself, there is the ascription, 'Quedam magistri Roberti expositiones'.

In the absence of a more explicit ascription of this commentary to Robert Kilwardby, recourse must be had to an examination of the internal features of the work. It consists of an introduction and six *lectiones* on the text. As with other commentaries of Kilwardby, the introduction here includes a statement of the subject matter, mode of procedure, purpose and authorship, in terms of Aristotle's four causes. As in Kilwardby's course on the *Ars vetus*, the newer terminology from Aristotle is combined with older forms of these heads of introduction:<sup>13</sup> the *causa materialis* is characterized as 'de quo' and 'subiectum' (§ 2); the *causa formalis*, by 'quomodo' — in regard to the *Ars vetus* it is commonly 'qualiter' — and 'modus agendi et ordinandi' (§ 6); the *causa finalis*, by 'ad quid', 'propter quid' and 'finis' (§ 7). The introduction also includes preliminary questions as is customary with Kilwardby.

The designation of the six divisions of the commentary on the text as *lectiones* is supported by the commentator's own choice of terms when he says: 'Circa primam partem huius lectionis ...' (§ 99); '... hoc est manifeste contra auctorem in principio sequentis lectionis' (§ 111); and 'Consequenter queritur circa ultimam

<sup>13</sup> For a study of Kilwardby's technique of introduction, combining the four causes of Aristotle with the introductory heads used by Boethius in expounding the *Isagoge* and those employed by Adam of Balsham in his *Ars disserendi*, see P. O. Lewry, *Robert Kilwardby's Writings on the Logica vetus Studied with Regard to Their Teaching and Method* (D. Phil. thesis, Oxford, 1978), pp. 215-26.

particulam lectionis ...' (§ 172). It is also matched by instances of the same usage in Kilwardby's commentary on *Priscianus minor*.<sup>14</sup> But towards the end of *De accentibus* the commentator also uses the term *capitulum*, as in saying: 'Circa hoc capitulum in generali contingit dubitare ...' (§ 215); and 'Consequenter queritur circa ultimam partem huius capituli ...' (§ 230). This usage is more frequent in Kilwardby's commentary on the *Barbarismus*.<sup>15</sup>

After the initial *lectio* the commentator uses a variety of introductory formulae for the subsequent *lectiones*, by which he refers to the material just treated: 'Postquam determinavit (auctor) ... in hac parte determinat / hic incipit determinare / hic determinat Priscianus ...', 'Postquam manifestavit ... hic manifestat ...', 'Determinato de ... in hac parte determinat de ...' These are all within Kilwardby's characteristic range of opening formulae. Each *lectio* also includes a division of the text, sometimes identified with 'sententia in generali', in a form that is quite in line with that used by Kilwardby. The particular exposition is regularly introduced with 'In speciali sic procedit, dicens ....' This is an introductory formula that Kilwardby uses in the *Barbarismus* commentary.<sup>16</sup> The parts of the exposition are commonly introduced with 'Consequenter' and usually end with 'Et hoc est quod dicit' and the lemma of the text just expounded, a form also found in Kilwardby's *Barbarismus* commentary.<sup>17</sup>

The question section of the *lectiones* on the *De accentibus* is regularly introduced by a formula relating the questions to the exposition, as in saying: 'Dubitari autem potest de hiis que dicit in littera ...' (§ 22); 'Circa iam dicta incidunt dubitationes ...' (§ 50); 'Circa primam partem huius lectionis primo queritur hoc modo ...' (§ 99); 'Circa iam dicta incidit dubitatio ...' (§ 142); 'Circa hoc capitulum in generali contingit dubitare ...' (§ 215); and 'Circa iam dicta incidunt dubitationes penes singulas partes ...' (§ 258). This is not Kilwardby's practice in the commentary on *Priscianus minor*, where he generally prefers a simple formula such as 'Dubitatur hic primo' or 'Primo queritur'. The closest parallel there would be in the discussion of constructions in regard to the second book, where he uses the

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Kilwardby *In Priscianum minorem* 1, *lect.* 26 (V 28rb): '... sicut vult Priscianus in sequenti lectione' and (fol. 29vb): '... lectionem proximam sequentem ...'; *lect.* 27 (fol. 31ra): 'Nota quod dicit versus finem lectionis ...'

<sup>15</sup> Ed. Schmücker, p. 9 (212-213): 'Sic ergo patet diuisio huius libri per capitula. Sed nunc quaeritur de ordinatione istorum capitulorum'; p. 10 (228-229): 'Visa diuisione istius libri per capitula sequitur videre diuisionem capitulorum in se'; p. 82 (2-8, 14-16): 'Postquam determinauit de barbarismo ... in hoc capitulo intendit determinare de uitii annexis barbarismo et soloecismo .... Ordo capitulorum ex supradictis manifestus est. Diuiditur autem hoc capitulum in duas partes .... Deinde exemplificat sententiam uero huius capituli in speciali per inspectionem textus .... Dubitatur autem in hoc capitulo primo in generali ...'; etc.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 11 (272-273), 36 (50), etc.: 'In speciali sit procedit dicens, quod ....'

<sup>17</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, p. 11 (277-279): 'Consequenter dicit, quod METAPLASMUS EST IDEM, SED IN POEMATE, et sumitur poema pro sermone habente causam suae excusationis rationabilem, et hoc est quod dicit IN POEMATE etc.'

form 'Circa hanc constructionem primo queritur' several times;<sup>18</sup> closer still are the parallel forms in the more structured question sections of the *Barbarismus* commentary, where the transition from exposition is also sometimes made with 'circa' and parts of the verb 'incidere'.<sup>19</sup> The *De accentibus* commentary either responds immediately to questions or deals with pairs of arguments or more rarely three related arguments. The variety of formulae used is apparently greater than that used in Kilwardby's commentary on *Priscianus minor*, but not markedly different from that found in regard to the *Barbarismus*.<sup>20</sup> Although the commentator may signal his first question by saying 'primo dubitatur/queritur', subsequent arguments in a group will not be numbered but usually introduced with no more than 'Item' or 'Preterea'. Like Kilwardby in regard to the *Barbarismus*, in passing to a fresh inquiry he will use such forms as 'Consequenter queritur', 'Set tunc queritur', 'Sed adhuc dubitatur', 'Set iuxta hec incidit dubitatio'. The commonest form of response, as in Kilwardby's *Barbarismus* commentary, is also with 'Ad hoc/quod dicendum est', although numbered responses are also found where necessary ('Ad primum dicendum est', 'Ad secundum' and sometimes 'Ad tertium' or 'Ad ultimum'). Altogether these formal features of the *De accentibus* commentary are consistent with Kilwardby's authorship and may even suggest a place in his development after the *Priscianus minor* commentary and about the same time as the *Barbarismus*.

The choice of examples, where the author has not been misrepresented by his scribes, is sometimes telling for authorship. Thus, in regard to *Priscianus minor* Kilwardby several times uses his own name, 'Robertus', in discussions of the personal pronoun 'ego' or the vocative case,<sup>21</sup> and at least twice has references to England or the English, in explaining interrogatives and derived names.<sup>22</sup> It is somewhat surprising, then, that on an occasion when he is discussing first- and second-person forms in regard to the *Barbarismus* Kilwardby prefers to use the name 'Guillelmus'.<sup>23</sup> There too, however, one finds examples with an English

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Kilwardby *In Priscianum minorem* 2, *lect.* 11-14 (V 71ra, 71rb, 72rb, 72va).

<sup>19</sup> Cf. ed. Schmücker, p. 101 (18-19): 'Circa (contra ed.) hanc partem incidunt dubitabilia primo penes definitionem metaplasmī ...'; p. 117 (34): 'Incidunt autem hic dubitationes circa tria ...'; p. 136 (27): 'Circa tropum primo incidit dubitatio circa eius definitionem.'

<sup>20</sup> The questions on the *Barbarismus* are listed *ibid.*, pp. 184-95.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Kilwardby *In Priscianum minorem* 1, *lect.* 25 (V 26rb): "Ego, Robertus, sedeo"; (26va): "Ego, Robertus, ambulo"; *lect.* 26 (28va): "Ego, Robertus", "Tu, Willelmus" ... "Ego, Robertus, video Willelmum: ergo Willelmus videtur a me"; *lect.* 41 (52ra): "Ego, Robertus, vel tu, Willelmus"; *lib.* 2, *lect.* 1 (61ra): "Roberte, esto bone".

<sup>22</sup> *ibid.* 1, *lect.* 18 (V 17ra): "Quo vadis?" "Ad Angliam." "Vnde venis?" "De Francia." "Qua transis?" "Tenus Flandria." "Ubi es?" "In Anglia."; *lect.* 40 (50va): "Anglicus" idem <est> quod aliquis gentis Anglie.

<sup>23</sup> Ed. Schmücker, p. 67 (1164): "ego Guillelmus uel tu, Guillelme." In the second *lectio*, too, the following passage occurs, p. 55 (744-747): '... proprium nomen significat propriam substantiam, quam non est necesse finire per qualitatem aliquam nisi per epitheton uel nisi nomen proprium cedat

reference as he recalls ways of reassuring those who have to face the perils of the Channel crossing to reach France, or looks back with an expatriate's nostalgia to the beauties of London.<sup>24</sup> The telling examples in the *De accentibus* commentary are in *lectio* 5, where the commentator expounds the text on the accentuation of nouns: 'Robertus' is given as an instance of a proper noun ending in '-us' that would shorten the penultimate syllable but for the fact that it is long by position; 'Gallicus', 'Anglicus' and (at least in C) 'Scoticus', of common nouns that have 'c' between 'i' and 'u' in the penultimate place and are shortened in the penultimate syllable.<sup>25</sup> These examples are consistent with Kilwardby, a Parisian master from the north of England, being the author of this commentary.

Buried in Kilwardby's *Priscianus minor*, a lengthy unedited text, there may be some points for doctrinal comparison with the *De accentibus* commentary, but a more accessible text for comparison is the commentary on Donatus. The first *lectio*, with its discussion of barbarisms, has several passages which touch on accentuation. There Kilwardby explains that, although the ancient practice of indicating the length of syllables by signs in writing has fallen into disuse, the signs for accents have an indirect connection with length, so that a mistake can be made in marking a short syllable with a circumflex:

Et sciendum, quod habebat antiquitus tempus figuras in scripto, penes quas adiectas et detractas et immutatas et transmutatas accidebat tempori barbarismus in scripto secundum dictos quattuor modos, apud nos autem non habet nisi ex consequenti, quod patet sic: accentus habent in scripto notulas siue figuras siue repraesentationes; accentus enim est in syllaba longa uel breui, <et ita in tempore breui uel producto,> et ita notulae accentuum quodammodo et ex consequenti deseruiunt tempori. Unde sciendum, quod, si aliqua syllaba circumflectatur, necesse est ipsam produci, quare notula repraesentans circumflexum accentum, necessario repraesentans tempus productum. Si igitur illa notula ponatur supra syllabam breuem, notatur ipsam esse productam, et ita ei additur unum tempus, et ita fit barbarismus per additionem temporis in scripto.<sup>26</sup>

in agnomen, ut Guillelmus Albus (albus *ed.*) et huiusmodi.' Here Kilwardby is thinking of a name such as 'William White' or 'Guillaume Blanc', and it is not impossible that such a name was suggested by that of a student or acquaintance.

<sup>24</sup> *ibid.*, p. 98 (605-607): '... dicimus enim, quod est lacus magnus inter Angliam et Galliam, hoc est magnum mare, et hoc diximus, ne uideamur terrere alios uel excellenter mirari dicendo, quod sit ibi magnum mare.'

<sup>25</sup> (§ 206): '... si propria, corripiunt penultimam, ut *Tullius*, nisi sint ibi positione longa, ut *Robertus* et huiusmodi .... Si autem habeant *c* inter *i* et *u* in penultimo loco, corripiuntur in penultima, ut *Gallicus*, *Anglicus*, *Scoticus* ....'

<sup>26</sup> Ed. Schmücker, p. 13 (333-343). The crucial addition in angle brackets, omitted through homoeoteleuton by the editor, has been supplied from C III, fol. 1vb and V 92va.

The commentator on *De accentibus* makes no allusion to the older practice of marking the length of syllables, but he does justify the association of the circumflex with a long syllable (§ 154):

Circumflexus consistit in eleuatione et depressione; ad hoc autem quod eleuatio et depressio sint supra idem, ut supra eandem litteram, exigitur duplex tempus, quia utraque in unico tempore, nisi fuerit productum, fieri non potest simul; unde necesse est quod illa vocalis quae accipere debet circumflexum accentum habeat tempus productum; unde licet aliqua vocalis producat positione, cum supra ipsam vocalem unam et eandem fieri habeant et eleuatio et depressio ut iam dictum est, si ipsa vocalis fuerit breuis, supra ipsam fieri non potest accentus circumflexus: et sic patet causa quare circumflexus accentus non potest fieri nisi in littera naturaliter longa.

The combination of the raising and lowering of the voice requires the double measure that goes with a vowel that is long by nature.

Kilwardby then adduces the example of 'male sana' to illustrate the mistake that can arise with regard to accentuation in the case of two words that can sometimes form one compound word:

... si vox composita ex duabus dictionibus ut 'male sana', pronuntiatur diuisim (diuersim *ed.*) per duas dictiones, fit additio toni in pronuntiatione, quia <unius> dictionis unus est accentus principalis et plurium plures. Quare si dictio composita pronuntietur diuisa (diuersa *ed.*), facit barbarismum in pronuntiatione ex additione toni, quia (qui *ed.*) uoci habenti unicum tonum attribuitur tonus duplex (simplex *ed.*). Si vero (verso *ed.*) econuerso, scilicet uox duarum dictionum composite proferatur, ut si haec vox 'male sanus' (male sanus *ed.*), secundum quod sunt duae dictiones, proferatur ut una dictio, subtrahatur accentus, et ita fit barbarismus ex detractone toni in pronuntiatione.<sup>27</sup>

Talk of 'tonus' here is a concession to the language of Donatus, but a similar point is made with the Pseudo-Priscian's language of 'accentus' in regard to the example of 'interea loci', used in the *De accentibus* (§ 96): '... si dicatur *interea loci*, si sit una dictio, cadit accentus supra ultimam huius quod dico *interea*; si due, non, inmo tunc sunt ibi duo accentus principales.'

With regard to aspiration, Kilwardby mentions mistakes that can arise from adding or dropping an 'h' in speech or writing:

... si aliqua littera, quae deberet leniter proferri, aspiretur in pronuntiatione, fit barbarismus in (ex *ed.*) pronuntiatione ex additione aspirationis, ut si 'o' in hac dictione 'omnis' aspiretur in pronuntiatione; si uero addatur in scripto nota aspirationis litterae, quae deberet scribi sine illa, fit barbarismus ex additione aspirationis in scripto, ut, si debeatur scribi haec dictio 'omnis' et scribatur per notam aspira-

<sup>27</sup> *ibid.* (362-370), with corrections from the common readings of C III, fol. 2ra and V 92va.

tionis praepositam; si autem scribatur haec dictio 'habeo' et scribatur sine nota aspirationis, fit barbarismus in scripto ex subtractione aspirationis.<sup>28</sup>

In the *De accentibus* commentary the special terminology is introduced that designates the accents used to mark an 'h' that is to be aspirated or not (§ 72):

Dasia autem est ad denotandum aliquam vocalem aspirari, cum ibi apponatur nota aspirationis, ut *hamus*, et fit super illam vocalem talis figura †. Silen autem est econtrario ad denotandum vocalem leniter debere proferri quando ei apponitur aspiratio in scripto, ut *hamo*, et fit super ipsam talis figura −.

The common feature is the description of 'h' as 'nota aspirationis', but that may be commonplace.

Later in the first *lectio*, when Kilwardby discusses the relationship between speech and writing, he lists the accidents of the syllable as 'tempus, numerus litterarum, species, accentus'.<sup>29</sup> This is the same enumeration that features in an argument in the introduction to the commentary on *De accentibus*, apart from 'spiritus', which may be more correct than 'species' (§ 10):

... cum spiritus et numerus litterarum accidant sillabe sicut accentus et tempus; non est autem scientia separata ab ethimologia in qua determinatur de spiritu vel numero litterarum: ergo nec similiter erit scientia separata in qua determinetur de accentu vel de tempore sicut poetica.

When Kilwardby examines Donatus' example 'Italiam', he cites a rule on the length of the first syllable in proper names that permits lengthening:

... regula est, quod propria nomina nisi fiunt positione producta, uel fuerit uocalis ante uocalem, in prima syllaba potest poni indifferenter, sed Italiam est proprium nomen, quare etc....<sup>30</sup>

The only comparable rule is in the exposition of *lectio 5* of the *De accentibus* (§ 182): '... si proprium, producitur in penultima non natura set usu vel differentie causa, ut *Maria*, *Stephania* ....' There is no exact parallel.

When Kilwardby returns to the topic of aspiration, he alludes to the assertion in *Priscianus minor* that 'k', 'q' and 'c' represent the same vocal element: '... k et q et c idem elementum repraesentant, ut dicit Priscianus ....'<sup>31</sup> This is the teaching to which the *De accentibus* commentator also alludes in similar terms, if in a different context, in his fifth *lectio* (§ 232): '... k et q et c idem elementum

<sup>28</sup> *ibid.*, p. 14 (397-404), with a correction from the common reading of C III, fol. 2ra and V 92va.

<sup>29</sup> *ibid.*, p. 22 (670).

<sup>30</sup> *ibid.*, p. 26 (826-828).

<sup>31</sup> *ibid.*, p. 30 (967).

representant secundum Priscianum ....' Kilwardby also uses an argument that develops the notion of dimensions of the letter and syllable:

... triplex est dimensio litterae et syllabae: una secundum altitudinem (*sic*) et illa est accentus, alia secundum longitudinem, et illa est tempus, tertia secundum latitudinem, et illa est spiritus.<sup>32</sup>

This is doubtless inspired by the text of the *De accentibus* that the commentator explains in saying (§ 18), '... vox habet altitudinem in accentu, et latitudinem in spiritu, et longitudinem in tempore.' Shortly afterwards, Kilwardby has an argument that the aspirate is not a letter because breathing out or in makes utterance impossible:

... Aristoteles dicit in secundo *De anima* [quod] expirantem et inspirantem impossibile est uocare id est uocem facere hoc (*hic ed.*) est dictu solum per emissionem aeris, uel solum per attractionem eiusdem non fit uox, quod patet per experimentum, sed oportet, quod in faciendo uocem contineatur aer et frangatur et figuretur per instrumenta (-tum *ed.*) uocis; aspiratio autem solum fit per expirationem, quia solum per emissionem aeris, quare aspiratio non facit uocem, sed omnis littera in pronuntiatione facit uocem, ergo aspiratio non est littera.<sup>33</sup>

The question is not without importance, because Schmücker has appealed to Kilwardby's handling of this matter in arguing that a Donatus commentary attributed to 'Robertus' in ms. Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana Marc. lat. XIII 36 (3992), fols. 50vb-59rb, is not by Kilwardby.<sup>34</sup> In the *De accentibus* commentary, *lectio* 2, there is a solution to the question why there is no counterpart to the circumflex, which is composed of acute and grave accents, in the case of rough and smooth breathings (§ 66):

Dicit Aristotiles in secundo *De anima* quod inspirantem vel expirantem tantum impossibile est vocare, hoc est uocem facere. Set spiritus solummodo fit in expiratione aeris: quare, si ex spiritu leni et aspero componeretur spiritus tertius, fieret forte nimia emissio aeris et sola emissio. Hoc autem esset contra bonitatem soni vel vocis; non enim sic fieret vox, ut patet per propositionem Aristotilis iam dictam. Vnde bonitas vocis generande non permittit tertium spiritum fieri qui componatur ex aspero et leni. Sic autem non est ex parte accentus: acutus enim accentus est secundum quod aer eleuatur secundum magis et minus ad superiores partes vocalis arterie; grauis autem fit per emissionem aeris deorsum ad inferiores partes vocalis arterie. Set in hiis potest aer contineri, frangi et figurari et inmitti deorsum antequam exprimatur, sicut patet ymaginando huiusmodi experimentum. Ista autem conferunt

<sup>32</sup> *ibid.*, p. 31 (974-976).

<sup>33</sup> *ibid.* (989-996), with corrections from C III, fol. 4ra and V 93vb.

<sup>34</sup> *ibid.*, p. xxi. The Robertus of the Venice manuscript, in a less developed treatment than that of Kilwardby, agrees that 'h' is not a letter but describes it as an 'intentio vocis' (fol. 53rb), an expression not used by Kilwardby in this regard.

ad bonitatem vocis siue soni, et non inpediunt, et propterea ex hiis duobus accentibus potest fieri tertius ex hiis compositus.

The comparison is the more striking because the arguments occur in one case in an objection and in the other in a solution, and the questions at issue are different. In each case, however, the somewhat *recherché* authority has been used to suggest that in aspiration there is a breathing out which is incompatible with that breaking and shaping of retained air, which comes first in speech production, and the raising and lowering of the voice associated with accentuation.

Kilwardby's account of aspiration in the Donatus commentary is that 'h' is not a letter in an unqualified sense because it is incompletely formed:

... non est littera simpliciter secundum quid tamen, et propterea habet figuram in scripto ordinatam cum aliis figuris litterarum, et quod non sit simpliciter littera, sic ostenditur: ad hoc enim, quod sit simpliciter littera, oportet, quod aër in generatione uocis simpliciter frangatur et figuretur per instrumenta informantia vocem. Sed quando generatur aspiratio, non est aër complete formatus et figuratus uel fractus, sed quasi incipit frangi et incomplete frangitur et figuratur, et ideo non est simpliciter littera, est tamen littera secundum quid, quia in eius generatione incipit frangi aër, et ideo habet figuram, quae est materiale ad litteram, et sic est materialiter littera et non simpliciter, secundum quae alia accidentia litterae et syllabae non sunt materialiter litterae. Vnde non habent figuras in scripto, uel si habent, illae non ordinantur inter figuras litterarum in eadem littera cum illis.<sup>35</sup>

The closest counterpart in the *De accentibus* commentary is found in the solution immediately preceding the one last cited (§ 65):

Asper spiritus, siue aspiratio, est incompletus sonus, quia in eius generatione incipit aer frangi et figurari, set non complete frangitur et figuratur, et ex hoc quod aliquo modo facit sonum, licet incomplete, habeat figuram in scripto.

Again, it is the inchoate character of aspiration that is stressed: air is partly interrupted and shaped but not completely, and as there is some kind of vocalization, there is some written representation.

The first *lectio* of Kilwardby's commentary on the *Barbarismus* concludes with a discussion of the sound of words and mistakes in that regard including those that might appear to arise from a diversity of accents. He replies by distinguishing between sound qualities that arise from the way in which particular letters are formed and those that depend on their relationship with others:

... sonoritas et insonoritas duplex est: una autem est in littera una absolute et haec causatur ex generatione et loco generationis, alia autem est in littera comparata ad alteram, et haec sonoritas uel insonoritas causatur ex proportionem uel improporitionem

<sup>35</sup> *ibid.*, pp. 31-32 (1000-12).



in sono. Quod autem generatio sit causa sonoritatis uel insonoritatis in littera una absolute, sic ostenditur: generari enim in maiori apertione est causa plus habendi de sono, generari autem in minori apertione est causa minus habendi de sono, et apertio maior et minor causant sonoritatem et insonoritatem. Quomodo autem locus generationis sit causa, sic ostenditur: dicit Aristoteles in libro *De anima*, quod tria concurrunt ad bonitatem soni, scilicet siccitas et concauitas et planities; siccitas, ut faciat claritatem soni, quia humiditas facit raucitatem eiusdem per oppositum; concauitas, quia in loco concauo uox sicut aër formatur et percutit partes undique. Sicut uno ictu multi soni generantur, et sic multiplicatur sonus; planities, ut fiat aequaliter percussio aëris, ita quod non impediatur, quin bene sonet. Sic igitur est, quod, si deficiant ista tria uel aliquod istorum impeditur bonitas soni. Si autem nullum istorum deficiat, est bonitas, et ita fit quandoque sonoritas, quandoque insonoritas, et haec patent per experimentum.<sup>36</sup>

In *lectio* 3 the commentator on *De accentibus* associates *sonoritas* with the principal accent in a word and the protraction of utterance when the voice is raised rather than lowered, against the natural downward movement of the organs of speech (§§ 100-101). He also makes the connection between opening and raising in terms that resemble those of Kilwardby (§ 102): ‘... instrumenta magis aperiuntur in eleuatione et magis clauduntur in depressione quam econuerso; sonoritas autem et vox magis generantur in apertione quam in clausione ....’ *Insonoritas* is alluded to later in regard to the position of the principal accent in a word (§ 116):

... si caderet accentus principalis alibi sicut in loco precedente antepenultimum locum, fieret nimia depressio et ita nimia insonoritas, ut patet in hac dictione *predixerat*. Si enim fiat accentus principalis supra primam sillabam, nimia esset depressio per tres subsequentes versus finem dictionis et ita nimia insonoritas, sicut patet experimento vel sensibiliter si proferatur dictio illa tali modo.

Considerations of euphony feature in the next reply (§ 117):

... patet quod ad eufoniam faciendam post eleuationem principalis accentus non debet fieri nisi una depressio vel due ad plus si principalis accentus in eo quod talis solum consistit in eleuatione .... Acutus autem accentus non habet nisi eleuationem solum: unde si ponatur in penultima sillaba, sequitur ipsum una depressio; si in antepenultima, duplex; et tantum bene permittat sonoritas et eufonia, set non sinit triplicem vel quadruplicem depressionem, etc., subsequi eleuationem accentus principalis. Vnde tantum in penultima et antepenultima potest fieri accentus ....

There is nothing here to match Kilwardby's three factors that contribute to sounding well (dryness for clarity, hollowness for resonance and smoothness for consistency), but then the preoccupation is different, the consequence of lowering the voice more than twice after raising it at the principal accent.

<sup>36</sup> *ibid.*, pp. 33-34 (1064-81).

To sum up. The style of the *De accentibus* commentary is similar to that of Kilwardby's grammatical commentaries. Examples used suggest that the commentator may be an Englishman called Robert. The doctrine is not at variance with that of the *Barbarismus* of Kilwardby, where comparison is possible, and at times the similarity of expression is striking even when the point at issue is not the same. Comparison with other commentaries, where contrasts of style, examples, doctrine and expression are found, may serve to strengthen the conclusion that the work under consideration is indeed by Robert Kilwardby.

## II

Copies of *De accentibus* survive in over a hundred manuscripts, the earliest being from the eleventh century.<sup>37</sup> The attribution of this work to Priscian, generally accepted in the Middle Ages, is regarded as doubtful by recent scholarship. Although Priscian in his *Institutiones* (III.133.1) refers to a book of his own treating this subject, the *De accentibus* that has come down to us exhibits both agreements with and differences from the style and teaching of his work, so that it has been suggested that in its present form it may derive from excerpts of the original treatise, edited by another grammarian.<sup>38</sup> The text was edited by Keil from two manuscripts: Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit Perizonius F. 55 (= G), fols. 45r-47v (s. XII), and Wolfenbüttel, Herzog-August-Bibliothek Cod. Guelf. 4.11 Aug. 4° (= H), fols. 134v-140v (s. XI/XII).<sup>39</sup> A comparison with the text of Thierry of Chartres' *Eptateuchon*, formerly in MS. Chartres, Bibliothèque Municipale 497 (141), fols. 162v-165v (s. XII),<sup>40</sup> revealed many divergences from the printed text, some clearly errors, and at one point a presentation of definitions in the question-and-answer style of Donatus' *Ars minor*.

A dozen thirteenth-century manuscripts contain unascribed treatises on accentuation,<sup>41</sup> most of which are likely to derive in part from the Pseudo-Priscian. There

<sup>37</sup> Of the 103 manuscripts of *De accentibus* described in Bursill-Hall, *Census*, 2 are said to be of the eleventh century, 3 of the eleventh/twelfth, 10 of the twelfth, 4 of the twelfth/thirteenth, 3 of the twelfth/fourteenth, 18 of the thirteenth, 7 of the thirteenth/fourteenth, 18 of the fourteenth, 35 of the fifteenth and 3 without dates.

<sup>38</sup> See R. Helm, 'Priscianus' in G. Wissowa, W. Kroll and K. Mittelhaus, eds., *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* 22.2 (Stuttgart, 1954), col. 2342.

<sup>39</sup> H. Keil, ed., *Prisciani grammatici caesariensis Institutionum grammaticarum libri XVIII* (Grammatici latini 3; Leipzig, 1859, rpt. Hildesheim, 1961), pp. 518-28.

<sup>40</sup> This codex, destroyed in World War II, was consulted on microfilm preserved at the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Toronto.

<sup>41</sup> The contents of those manuscripts are described by Bursill-Hall, *Census*, nos. 37.8.2, 44.5, 44.25, 53.2.1, 66.6, 107.3.2, 149.159, 208.28.1, 208.118.2, 231.10.8, 313.6.1. Of course, many thirteenth-century works may also be preserved in manuscripts of a later century, but this count may serve to indicate the survival of material copied close to Kilwardby's lifetime.

are also treatments within more general works on grammar. Of the two most influential verse expositions of grammar circulating in the thirteenth century, Évrard of Béthune's *Graecismus* lacks any distinct treatment of accentuation;<sup>42</sup> Alexander of Villedieu's *Doctrinale*, composed between 1199 and 1212, has only sixty-six lines devoted to this subject, but the work offers some parallels to that of the Pseudo-Priscian, although a new terminology of 'accentus moderatus' is introduced for something between an acute and grave accent.<sup>43</sup> A late thirteenth-century prose treatment is to be found in the *Summa gramatice* now known to be by Petrus de Isoella Cremonensis, edited without ascription by Fierville.<sup>44</sup> This account comprises definitions of the three principal accents and rules covering the various parts of speech in a form which more clearly betrays dependence on the Pseudo-Priscian.

There are also a few surviving commentaries on *De accentibus* from thirteenth-century university teaching. At Paris no mention is made of this as a text for exposition in the legatine ordinances of 1215, although 'the two Priscians' — presumably, then, *Priscianus maior* and *minor*, or at least one, are prescribed for ordinary lectures, and the *Barbarismus* of Donatus is mentioned as a suitable text for lectures on feast days.<sup>45</sup> Priscian is mentioned again, but without further specification, in Pope Gregory X's letter of 13 April 1231 on the statutes to be observed by masters.<sup>46</sup> In 1252 bachelors determining in arts in the English nation were required by statute to have heard ordinary lectures on *Priscianus minor* and the *Barbarismus* twice, or at least cursorily, and at least once cursorily on *Priscianus maior*.<sup>47</sup> On 19 March 1255 the first explicit mention is made of the text as 'Priscianus *De accentu*' in a statute of the faculty of arts, regulating the time to be spent in teaching the set-books of the curriculum. At that time, if we assume Priscian's *Institutiones* to have been begun on 1 October and combined with the new logic (Aristotle's *Topica*, *Elenchi*, *Analytica priora* and *posteriora*), the course

<sup>42</sup> See J. Wrobel, ed., *Eberhardi bethuniensis Graecismus* (Bratislava, 1887).

<sup>43</sup> See D. Reichling, ed., *Das Doctrinale des Alexander de Villa-Dei* (Monumenta Germaniae paedagogica 12; Berlin, 1893), pp. 152.2282-156.2347. The chapter begins (2282-91): 'Accentus varias decet hinc distinguere normas./ est gravis accentus, et sunt moderatus, acutus,/ et circumflexum multi tenuere priorum./ hic gravis est, qui deprimitur nec tendit in altum./ ut gravis incipiet, sed in altum tendit acutus./'. A general discussion of the medieval literature which gives prominence to Alexander's work is to be found in Thurot, *Extraits de divers manuscrits*, pp. 392-407.

<sup>44</sup> For the ascription, see R. W. Hunt, 'Hugutio and Petrus Helias' in *Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies*, ed. R. W. Hunt and R. Klibansky, 2 (London, 1950), p. 177 n. 3 (reprinted in Hunt, *History of Grammar*, p. 148); for the text, C. Fierville, *Une grammaire latine inédite du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle, extraite des manuscrits n° 465 de Laon et n° 15462 (Fonds latin) de la Bibliothèque Nationale* (Paris, 1886), pp. 124-28.

<sup>45</sup> H. Denifle and É. Chatelain, eds., *Chartularium universitatis parisiensis*, 4 vols. (Paris, 1889-97), 1.78, no. 20.

<sup>46</sup> *ibid.* 1.138, no. 79.

<sup>47</sup> *ibid.* 1.228, no. 201.

was to be completed by 25 March or an equivalent period of about twenty-five weeks. If they were read together, and on their own, the three short texts – the anonymous treatment of the last six categories (the *Liber sex principiorum*), the *Barbarismus* and *De accentibus* – were to be completed in six weeks.<sup>48</sup> In the oath prescribed before 1366 for bachelors undergoing examinations at Sainte-Geneviève, the *De accentibus* is listed amongst the *Parva logicalia*, against which there is a note indicating that the requirement of lectures may be dispensed.<sup>49</sup>

The medieval statutes regulating teaching to be heard by determiners and inceptors at Oxford make no mention of the *De accentibus*, but they confirm the impression that *Priscianus minor* was the text given most attention; that the *maior* was not always lectured on; and that Donatus' work was of less account than that of Priscian.<sup>50</sup> But silence of the statutes cannot always be taken to argue neglect of a text, and it is likely that at Paris – and perhaps at Oxford too – the *De accentibus* was already taught with the other secondary text, the *Barbarismus*, early in the thirteenth century and thus implicitly included with it in the legatine ordinances of 1215, which confirmed current practice. A small survival of commentaries attests its presence in university teaching in the mid-thirteenth century. If Kilwardby's teaching as a master in arts at Paris is placed around 1238-45, his commentary at least would antedate the earliest statutory reference in 1255 and bear witness to an older practice.

Besides the two manuscripts, C and V, containing Kilwardby's commentary on *De accentibus*, two more containing other thirteenth-century expositions were described by Bursill-Hall<sup>51</sup> and have been examined for this study.

Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 14460 (= M) has been described at length by Martin Grabmann in his account of the writings of Nicholas of Paris.<sup>52</sup> Fols. 188rb-201('210')rb contain a group of grammatical writings relevant to this study (after fol. 189 the foliation jumps to '199' without apparent loss of text):

- (1) fols. 188rb-192['201']va: first commentary on Pseudo-Priscian *De accentibus, inc. prol. et lect. 1* 'L (space of two lines for the lemma 'Littera est nota elementi, etc.' [1.1; 519.2]). Sermocinales sciencie sunt uie ad alias sciencias secundum quod alie fiunt doctrine in discipulo'; *expl. lect. 4* (fol. 191['200']rb) '... distat enim ab illa per multa media ideo etc.'; *inc. lect. 5* (fol. 191['200']rb) 'Latina quidem propria nomina etc. (III.14; 521.33) In proximo positus regulis accentuandi sillabas diccio-

<sup>48</sup> *ibid.* 1.278, no. 246.

<sup>49</sup> *ibid.* 2.678, no. 1185 (14).

<sup>50</sup> See *Statuta antiqua universitatis oxoniensis*, ed. S. Gibson (Oxford, 1931), pp. xc-xciv, 26, 33-34, 200, 378.

<sup>51</sup> Bursill-Hall, *Census*, pp. 153, 265.

<sup>52</sup> M. Grabmann, 'Die logischen Schriften des Nikolaus von Paris und ihre Stellung in der aristotelischen Bewegung des XIII. Jahrhunderts' in *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben. Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der Scholastik und Mystik*, 3 vols. (Munich, 1926-50), 1.222-48.

num penultimas hic incipit determinare de accentu ipsarum dictionum in se'; *expl. lect. 6* '... antepenultima ut inordinata iteratur ad ordinem secundum artem reducatur. Explicit scriptum magistri Nicolai Parisiensis. Item Iohannes de Roszstok scripsit istud qui sit benedictus etc. Amen.'

- (2) fols. 192['201']vb-199['208']rb: a commentary on Donatus' *Barbarismus, inc. prol. et lect. 1* 'Gramatica aliter a Donato aliter a Prisciano diuiditur quia a Prisciano diuiditur in 4 partes secundum suum subiectum ...'; *expl. lect. 9* '... exprimendi melius sententiam.'
- (3) fols. 199['208']rb-201['210']rb: second commentary on Pseudo-Priscian *De accentibus, inc. prol. et lect. 1* 'Inter cetera sensuum obiecta non est ita tam conueniens instrumentum ad interplicandum a doctore in discipulum vt sermo'; *expl. lect. 4* '... set ibi plures littere sunt materiales una autem formalis et illi adiudicatur tempus. Explicit.'

Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana Marc. lat. XIII 36 (3992) (= R) is a parchment codex of the thirteenth/fourteenth century, with 68 folios, written in double columns of 44 lines in an Italian hand and with flourished pen decorations.<sup>53</sup> It contains the following items:

- (1) fols. 1ra-50va: a commentary on *Priscianus minor* ('Robertus super xvii<sup>o</sup> et xviii<sup>o</sup> Prisciani'), *inc. prol. et lect.* 'Nobilitas scientie aut est propter demonstrationem aut propter nobilitatem subiecti aut propter nobilitatem utriusque sicut dicit Aristotiles in principio libri de anima'; *expl. lib. 2* '... sic contingit significari per genitium. Deo gracias. Amen. Explicit sententia Prisciani siue notule Robertine. Incipit Donatus Barbarismi.'
- (2) fols. 50vb-59rb: a commentary on Donatus' *Barbarismus, inc. prol. et lect. 1* 'Quoniam diuisio scienciarum causatur ex diuisione rerum ex quibus fiunt sciencie sicut uult Aristotiles ideo necesse est ad hoc ut habeatur diuisio scienciarum diuidere subiectum ex quibus sunt'; *expl. lect. 7* '... aut rerum eiusdem generis aut rerum disimilium generum etc. Explicit sententia Barbarismi.'
- (3) fols. 59rb-65va: a commentary on *De accentibus* ('Incipit liber de accentibus Prisciani secundum Robertum'), *inc. prol. et lect. 1* 'Ars imitatur naturam in quantum potest sicut habetur in multis locis nec consequitur eam licet multum laboret'; *expl. lect. 5* '... vnde non bene dicatur homo et albus currunt etc. Expliciunt notule Prisciani de accentibus. Explicit sententia de accentibus secundum magistrum Robertum. Deo gracias. Amen.'
- (4) fols. 65vb-66va: a division of the sciences, 'Incipit diuisio scienciarum quedam secundum eundem', *inc.* 'Sicut scribitur in fine secundi Posteriorum omnis sciencia est cum ratione cuius principium est intellectus set de non ente non est ratio nec intellectus ...'; *expl.* '... Patet ergo quod non est diminuta nec superflua logices diuisio etc. Explicit.'

<sup>53</sup> This codex, described here from microfilm, has not been inspected *in situ*; cf. Bursill-Hall, *Census*, no. 290.21.

- (5) fols. 66va-68rb: questions on negation and the equivocal noun ('Questiones quedam de negacione et de nomine equiuoco'), *inc.* 'Potest probari quod negacio in genere que dicitur priuacio non differat a negacione simpliciter que est negacio extra genus in hunc modum ...'; *expl.* '... propter hoc deceptus per equiuocationem decipiatur secundum plures interrogaciones ut unam etc. Explicit hoc opus. Deo gracias. Amen.'

The final verso (fol. 68v) carries a fifteenth-century inscription recording the gift of the codex by Petrus de Montagnana, a priest of Venice and distinguished teacher of Latin, Greek and Hebrew grammar, to the Canons Regular of St. Augustine for the use of those dwelling in the monastery of San Giovanni in Viridario, Padua, in 1478.<sup>54</sup>

Besides these two manuscripts noted by Bursill-Hall, a third is worthy of note because it also contains authentic works of Kilwardby.

Cambridge, Peterhouse 206 (= P) is a parchment codex of the late thirteenth century of iv + 330 folios, written in double columns of 60 lines in two different English hands, with headlines in red and blue capitals and initials decorated with pen flourishing in what appears to be a late thirteenth-century English style.<sup>55</sup> The series of works copied in one hand and occupying the first three gatherings (fols. 1ra-31va, followed by fol. 32, a blank leaf) are of particular interest for this study:

- (1) fols. 1ra-5ra: a commentary on the *Isagoge* of Porphyry, *inc. prol.* 'Ad euidenciam eorum que determinantur in isto libro sciendum est primo quod in qualibet sciencia 4 concurrent cause ...'; *inc. exp.* (fol. 1ra) 'Cum sit necessarium Grisarorii et ad etc. Iste liber cuius subiectum est uniuersale predicabile diuiditur in duas partes in prohemium et execucionem'; *expl.* '... et pocius diffinit accidens per negacionem aliorum quam per aliquod aliud. Hec queruntur super librum Porfirii.'
- (2) fols. 5ra-13va: a commentary on the *Praedicamenta* of Aristotle, *inc.* 'Equiuoca dicuntur quorum nomen commune est. Iste liber cuius subiectum est ens dicibile incomplexum ordinabile in genere a principio diuiditur in [duas] tres partes ...'; *expl.* '... quod est quod aliquis dicitur habere aliquid secundum qualitatem.'
- (3) fols. 13va-21ra: a commentary on the *Perihermeneias* of Aristotle, *inc.* 'Primum oportet constituere quid sit nomen et quid uerbum etc. Iste liber cuius subiectum est enunciatio diuiditur in duas partes in prohemium et execucionem'; *expl.* '... et hoc est quod dicit Si ergo quod bonum est etc. Hec est sententia presentis leccionis.'

<sup>54</sup> 'Hunc librum donauit venerabilis presbiter et eximius grammaticae latine grece hebraiceque doctor dominus Petrus de Montagnana congregationi canonicorum regularium lateranensi sancti Augustini ita ut sit tantum ad usum dictorum canonicorum in monasterio sancti Iohannis in Viridario Padue commorantium. MCCCCLXXVIII' (R 68v).

<sup>55</sup> Described by James, *Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts of the Library of Peterhouse*, pp. 245-47, and more fully by Lewry, *Robert Kilwardby's Writings*, pp. 16-22.

- (4) fols. 21ra-28ra: a commentary on the anonymous *Liber sex principiorum*, *inc. prol.* 'Cum ad cognicionem cuiuslibet sciencie iiii<sup>or</sup> concurrant cause scilicet causa efficiens causa materialis causa formalis causa finalis propter hoc in ista sciencia dicendum est de istis causis'; *inc. exp.* (fol. 21rb) 'Forma est composicioni contingens etc. Iste liber cuius subiectum est ens dicibile etc. diuiditur in tres partes ...'; *expl.* 'Et hoc est Set quare etc. Hec est sententia leccionis et per consequens tocius Libri sex principiorum.'
- (5) fols. 28ra-29va: a commentary on Pseudo-Priscian *De accentibus*, *inc. prol.* 'Grammatica diuiditur in 4 partes scilicet in orthographia et ethimologia et diasintetica et prosodia'; *inc. exp. lect.* 1 (fol. 28ra) 'Littera est nota elementi que cum etc. (i.1; 519.2) Iste liber cuius subiectum est uox accentualis diuiditur in duas ...'; *expl. lect.* 5 '... sexta ibi ix sillaba finita etc. (III.31; 525.34-35) Hec est diuisio presentis leccionis et per consequens tocius libri accentus.'
- (6) fols. 29va-31va: a commentary on the *Barbarismus* of Donatus, *inc. prol.* 'Sermocinalis sciencia diuiditur in tres partes scilicet in gramaticam logicam rethoricam. Habita logica rethorica dicendum est de gramatica'; *inc. exp.* (fol. 29va) 'Barbarismus est una pars uiciosa est. Iste liber cuius subiectum est sermo uiciosus prout se extendit ad sermonem uiciosum simpliciter et ad sermonem figuratiuum diuiditur in duas partes ...'; *expl.* '... dicitur figura locucionis, quando ponitur pars pro toto uel totum pro parte. Hec sunt que queruntur supra Barbarismum.'

Among the other items in this codex are:

- (7-9) fols. 33ra-79rb: Kilwardby's commentaries on the *Ars vetus*, 'Note Porfirii, Predicatorum, Periarmentis' (incomplete)
- (14) fols. 285ra-307vb: Kilwardby's commentary on the *Ethica nova* and *vetus* (books 1-3)
- (15) fols. 308ra-329vb: Pseudo-Kilwardby's commentary on *Priscianus maior* (incomplete).<sup>56</sup>

For comparison with Kilwardby's commentary on *De accentibus*, these three manuscripts, M, R and P, appear to have yielded another four commentaries. However, the first commentary in M exhibits discontinuities of style after the fourth *lectio*: in *lectiones* 5 and 6 the openings with 'Superius determinauit/determinatum est' are replaced by ablative absolute forms; a short exposition of the text replaces the division with the characteristic formula 'prima est presentis leccionis'; instead of the longer series of objections followed by a series of replies, there is a more frequent alternation of objections and replies, and instead of the formula 'Ad aliud/Ad ultimum dicendum', 'Ad hoc/quod dicendum'. There is, in fact, sufficient contrast of style to conclude that material from two works has been patched together here. The first four *lectiones* may be identified as commentary M.I(a); *lectiones* 5 and 6, as commentary M.I(b).

<sup>56</sup> This is the copy represented by the siglum B in the partial edition of Fredborg et al., *The Commentary on Priscianus maior*, p. 2+.

The German scribe's colophon ascribed M.I to Nicholas of Paris. The presence of a master of this name at Paris is attested in the years 1254 and 1263.<sup>57</sup> Comparison of the material on the *De accentu* with other works ascribed to Nicholas in M and in MS. Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Vat. lat. 3011 suggests that it is in fact M.I(a) that resembles Nicholas' other writings most closely, and that ascription in the colophon thus looks back to the beginning of the work. M.I(b) appears, then, to be adventitious material from another source used to supply coverage of the text in the last two *lectiones*.

Why such patching may have been necessary may appear from a remark in the second commentary on *De accentibus* in M, which may be designated M.II. The four *lectiones* of this work take the exposition only to the sentence before the lemma 'Latina quidem propria nomina' (III.14; 521.33), the point at which Nicholas' treatment in M.I(a) ends, also in four *lectiones*. The reason may be clear from the opening of *lectio* 4 in M.II, where the commentator begins (fol. 201['210']):

MONOSILLABA VERO, etc. (perhaps II.10; 521.5) <In> parte precedenti determinauit actor de accentu, ostendens in quota sillaba esset locandus; hic in quanta. Et diuiditur ista pars in duas: in prima docet hoc in generali; in secunda, in speciali ad bene esse ibi, LATINA QUIDEM, etc. (III.14; 521.33) Prima est presentis lectionis, quia plus non solet legi.

At the time of the composition of this work — and probably, too, when Nicholas composed his commentary — it was no longer customary to lecture on the detailed account of accentuation in the various parts of speech; masters contented themselves with expounding the first third of the text, which gives a general treatment of the nature of accentuation and where it falls within the word.

Selective exposition of sections of set-books has continued to be the practice in university teaching. It was a practice that began early and to which there are several witnesses in the thirteenth-century literature from Paris. Examination compendia indicate that only the first six books of Euclid and the first two of Boethius *De musica* were required *de forma*;<sup>58</sup> the 1255 statute regulating the time allotted to the set-books only mentions four books of the *Ethica* although all ten books were translated by that time.<sup>59</sup> For the *Isagoge* of Porphyry there are many indications

<sup>57</sup> See the documentation in C. H. Lohr, 'Medieval Latin Aristotle Commentaries, Authors: Narcissus-Richardus', *Traditio* 28 (1972) 298-99.

<sup>58</sup> See P. O. Lewry, 'Thirteenth-Century Examination Compendia from the Faculty of Arts' in *Les genres littéraires dans les sources théologiques et philosophiques médiévales. Définition, critique et exploitation. (Actes du Colloque international de Louvain-la-Neuve 25-27 mai 1981)* (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1982), pp. 101-16.

<sup>59</sup> Denifle and Chatelain, eds., *Charularium universitatis parisiensis* 1.278, no. 246: 'Ethicas quantum ad quatuor libros in xij septimanis, si cum alio legantur; si per se non cum alio, in medietate temporis.'



from the commentators themselves that the last third of the text, the 'Communitates', dealing with the comparative treatment of the five universals, was considered of less value and could be passed over without exposition by the mid-thirteenth century.<sup>60</sup> There is no difficulty in appreciating that commentators on *De accentibus*, after the first enthusiasm, may have found the latter part of the text too preoccupied with the particularities of the Latin language to allow much scope to the speculative grammarian and hence given all their attention to the general considerations at the beginning of the text, where there was more to stimulate interest.

The commentator of M.Π has yet to be identified. Similarities of style suggest that he is also the author of the commentary on the *Barbarismus*, the work immediately preceding it in M. All the grammatical works in R appear to be from the same commentator, but the identity of this 'Robertus' has yet to be determined. Several works circulating in Italy under the name of 'Robertus' have been attributed to Kilwardby with insufficient reason.<sup>61</sup> MS. Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Conv. soppr. D.2.45 (s. XIII), fols. 1r-24v, for instance, contains a *Lectura super Priscianum minorem* attributed to 'Rubertus Anglicus', which merits closer study. Nothing clearly points to Kilwardby as the 'Robertus' of the works in R and Schmücker has argued on doctrinal grounds that the Donatus commentary there is not by Kilwardby.<sup>62</sup>

Whoever this 'Robertus' may be, his interest in accentuation is clear, and references to this branch of grammar are found in the *Priscianus minor* and *Barbarismus* commentaries. In the former he locates it more precisely than most commentators with regard to the other three parts of grammar (R 1rb):

Vnde tres sunt partes principales gramatice tocius, ortographia, ethimologia et dias<intasti>ca. Quarta uero pars, que est prosodia, non est principalis set adiunctiua; est enim de quodam accidente sillabe, sicut de accentu.

In the prologue to the *Barbarismus* commentary Robertus discusses prosody (R 51ra):

... queritur utrum possit esse ars separata de accentu. Videtur quod non: accentus enim est accidens sillabe; in eadem parte sciencie determinatur de subiecto et de eius accidente, sicut de linea et de recta linea; si ergo in orthographia determinat de sillaba, in eadem determinari habet de accentu.

Item, ad idem: quatuor accidunt sillabe, tempus, spiritus, tenor siue accentus, et numerus litterarum; ex quo ergo non est sciencia separata de aliis accidentibus, nec erit de accentu aliqua distincta sciencia.

<sup>60</sup> The evidence has been assembled in Lewry, *Robert Kilwardby's Writings*, pp. 255-56.

<sup>61</sup> See Lewry, 'Robertus Anglicus and the Italian Kilwardby', 33-51.

<sup>62</sup> See above, n. 34.

Ad quod dicendum quod quoddam accidens addicit nouam naturam subiecto, quoddam uero non. De accidente autem quod nouam naturam addit, propter hanc naturam diuersam habebit scienciam separatam, sicut patet de line<a> simpliciter determinatur in geometria, de linea uisuali siue radiosa in perspectiua. Eodem modo de sillaba determinatur in orthographia, set de sillaba accentuata in prosodia. Accentus enim non inest uoci nisi in comparacione ad significacionem, sicut inuitur in libro *De accentibus*; alia autem accidentia sillabe non insunt sillabe propter significacionem semper.

This response anticipates the assertion in the prologue to the *De accentibus* commentary of Robertus that the subject is the accent and not the syllable (R 59rb):

Causa materialis huius operis est accentus et non sillaba, nec determinatur hic de sillaba nisi propter accentum, quia non agnoscitur accidens nec passio nisi per cognicionem subiecti.

This is contrary to Kilwardby, who concedes the objection that the accent as such cannot be the subject, despite the title of the treatise, since the accent is merely an accident of speech, and holds instead that the subject is that which can be accentuated, in effect then the syllable (§ 4): ‘... accentuale vel accentuable est hic subiectum; accentus uero est passio probata de eo.’

In some ways, however, Robertus’ commentary resembles that of Kilwardby. The five *lectiones* cover the entire text of the *De accentibus* with *diuisio textus* and *expositio sententiae*. Like Kilwardby, Robertus alternates objections with responses. There is a notable difference, all the same, in Robertus’ organization of the question section in that he serially numbers the questions from beginning to end of the *lectio*, a device not found in Kilwardby’s commentaries. In the problematic itself there is also similarity and difference. Thus the opening question in Robertus’ first *lectio* comprises the following objections (R 59vb-60ra):

Primo queritur utrum debeat hic separatim de accentu determinari aut non, et uidetur quod non, set magis in orthographia: in quacumque enim parte determinatur de subiecto, in eadem parte determinari debet passio subiecti; set in orthographia determinat de sillaba; ergo ibidem debet determinari de accentu, non igitur separatim.

Item, sicut se habent tempus, spiritus et numerus litterarum ad sillabam, quia accidunt (60ra) sillabe, sic se habet accentus ad sillabam; set de predictis accidentibus non est doctrina separata; ergo nec de accentu.

These are substantially the same as the opening objections in Kilwardby’s prologue (§§ 9-10); the response, however, is very different (R 60ra):

Ad hoc dicendum quod quedam accidentia adiciunt aliquam nouam materiam supra subiectum, et quedam non. Si aliquam naturam nouam addiciant, tunc poterit esse doctrina separata de huiusmodi accidentibus, sicut patet de linea u<i>sualia <in> perspectiua, quia u<i>suale addit supra lineam, curuum autem et rectum non.

Eodem modo accentus aduenit sillabe in comparacione ad significacionem, alia autem accidentia minime. Inest enim accentus sillabe primo, ex consequenti dictioni propter discrecionem significacionis. Set numerus literarum potest esse in dictione non significatiua sicut in dictione significatiua, similiter et alia accidentia.

This is a development of the response already seen in the prologue to Robertus' *Barbarismus* commentary:<sup>63</sup> as in perspective the characterization of a line as a line of vision adds new material to the line treated in geometry and so justifies a distinct teaching, so the effect of the accent on meaning justifies a distinct teaching, where the number of letters or other grammatical accidents do not. Kilwardby's lengthy replies turn on different considerations: that knowledge of accentuation and metre depend on something posterior to the syllable, the word, and in regard to these there is more likelihood of error than with regard to other accidents of the syllable (§§ 11-12). Although Robertus has a further response in which he distinguishes between the general study of the proportions of utterances by the student of music and the particular study of the grammarian in regard to meaningful utterance,<sup>64</sup> he does not take account of the other part of prosody that deals with metre.

Throughout the commentary of Robertus there are points of comparison with the questions raised by Kilwardby, though the replies are usually less developed. This similarity is apparent, for instance, in the opening question of *lectio* 4 (R 64rb):

Primo queritur quomodo possibile est artem accentuandi dare; hoc enim non uidetur possibile. Infinitorum enim non est ars; propter quod si infinita (interminata *R*) sunt desinencia in *a*, similiter in *e*, et sic deinceps, non uidetur possibile quod certa sit aliqua ars accentuandi omnia nomina terminata in hiis litteris.

Ad quod dicendum quod infinitorum in quantum infinita sunt non est ars, set magis in quantum sunt finita, idest comprehensa sub uniuersali aliquo et non in se. Vnde non est regula de unoquoque desinente in *a*, ita quod de singulis in se, set in uniuersali, sicut nec geometria speculatur unumquodque triangulum in se, set in uniuersali quod est triangulus.

Kilwardby has an objection along similar lines, but in terms of the infinitude of nouns rather than of those ending in particular letters (§ 215), and a more developed response appealing to the general truths about the triangle as a counterpart to the general rules of grammar (§ 217). A more striking resemblance, however, is to be found in the opening question of M.ii, the completion supplied to Nicholas of Paris' commentary (M 191['200']va):

<sup>63</sup> See above, pp. 115-16.

<sup>64</sup> R 60va: '... musicus considerat proporcionem uocum in comparacione ad significacionem, et sic contingit ipsum considerare proporcionem uocum universaliter. Gramaticus autem considerat hanc proporcionem uocis prout comparatur ad significacionem; ipsi (et *cancell.*) enim pertinet uox significatiua.'

Primo queritur contra hoc quomodo possibile est dare regulas artem accentuandi; hoc enim non uidetur possibile. Infinitorum enim non est ars; quare si infinita sunt nomina desinencia in *a*, similiter nomina desinencia in *e*, et sic deinceps, non uidetur possibile quod aliqua sit certa ars accentuandi nomina in hiis terminancia.

Ad hoc dicendum quod infinitorum inquantum infinita non est ars, set magis finita inquantum sunt comprehensa sub uniuersali aliquo et non in se. Vnde non est regula de unoquoque desinente in *a*, siue de singulis in se, set secundum quod sunt in uniuersali, sicut nec geometria speculatur unumquemque triangulum in se, set in uniuersali quod est triangulus.

Here there is clearly dependence of one text on the other or a common source for this text and that of Robertus.

\*  
\* \*

The present edition of Robert Kilwardby's commentary on Pseudo-Priscian *De accentibus* has been made from a complete collation of microfilm of the two manuscripts known to preserve this commentary:

C = Cambridge, Peterhouse 191, section III, fols. 22ra-29vb

V = Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Chigi L. V. 159, fols. 104vb-109vb.

Although both witnesses clearly descend from a common archetype, they offer numerous variants, most of which do not affect the meaning in a significant fashion. The main concern has been to provide an intelligible text accompanied by an *apparatus criticus* that records the differences deemed more important. On balance, C seems to have a more trustworthy text, and so its readings have been adopted in preference to those of V in passages where V exhibits a plausible alternative; but the editor has not hesitated to follow V in instances where C is clearly in error. The *apparatus criticus* usually does not report such frequent occurrences as the omission or addition of *est*, *et* and *etc.*, use of *ergo* for *igitur*, *hoc* for *hec*, *quia* for *quod* and vice versa, and simple transpositions involving two, three or four words. Brief scribal corrections are also not recorded.

As for spelling, some attempt has been made to preserve medieval usage according to the conventions followed in the edition of Kilwardby's *De tempore*.<sup>65</sup> Modern practice has guided the choice of capitalization and punctuation. Italics are used for titles of works and terms adduced in discussion.

Angle brackets enclose the headings dividing the commentary into the *prologus* and six *lectiones* that can be ascertained from internal evidence. For convenient reference, paragraphs have been numbered separately, and internal references are made simply by paragraph numbers enclosed in square brackets.

<sup>65</sup> P. O. Lewry, ed., *Robert Kilwardby. On Time and Imagination. De tempore, De spiritu fantastico* (Auctores Britannici Medii Aevi 9; London, 1987), p. xxxvi.

ROBERTI DE KILWARDBY  
 <NOTULE LIBRI PRISCIANI *DE ACCENTIBUS*>

<PROLOGUS>

1. Accidentia, ut dicit Aristotiles in libro *De anima*, conferunt maximam C 22ra  
 5 partem cognitionis eius quod quid est; set id quod quid est est subiectum: conferunt V 104vb  
 ergo maximam partem cognitionis subiecti. Cum ergo sillaba sit quoddam sub-  
 iectum et pars subiecti grammaticae, ad hoc quod cognoscatur sillaba oportet  
 cognoscere eius accidentia. Cum ergo accentus et tempus sint accidentia sillabe,  
 ad hoc quod cognoscatur sillaba oportet cognoscere tempus et accentum, et  
 10 propterea duplex est scientia subalternata grammaticae: quarum una determinat  
 cognitionem accentus, sicut scientia tradita in hoc libro qui dicitur Priscianus *De*  
*accentibus*, quem pre manibus habemus; et altera que determinat cognitionem  
 temporis, sicut scientia poetica que tradit cognitionem temporis et pedum constan-  
 tium ex temporibus et metrorum constantium ex pedibus. Et ita patet que scientia  
 15 tradita est in hoc libro et cui parti philosophiae supponitur et qua necessitate.

2. Consequenter vero determinandum est de quo est ista scientia, et quomodo  
 de illo, et propter quid, et que sit causa efficiens. Quod accentus sit hic subiectum  
 videtur. Intitulatur enim *Liber de accentibus*. Cum ergo *de* notet habitudinem cause  
 materialis et sic subiecti, videtur quod accentus sit hic subiectum.

20 3. Quod autem non sit uidetur, quia subiectum inferioris scientie debet esse  
 sub subiecto superioris scientie; set subiectum grammaticae, cum sit sermocinalis  
 scientia, est aliquid ens in genere sermonis: ergo subiectum huius scientie oportet  
 quod sit sermo uel aliqua pars sermonis. Cum ergo accentus nec sit sermo, nec pars  
 sermonis, set accidens eius, non erit hic subiectum.

25 4. Quod [3] concedendum est. Vnde dicendum est quod accentuale vel  
 accentuabile est hic subiectum; accentus vero est passio probata de eo.

4-5 Arist., *De an.* 1.1 (402b21-22).

---

2 Liber de accentibus C: om. V 4-5 conferunt...partem om. V 5 est<sup>3</sup> s.s. add. C: om.  
 V 8 accentus] accidens C 9 quod] ut C 10 una om. V 11 accentus] accidentis  
 V 12 quem...habemus om. V que determinat] autem tradit C 13 sicut...temporis om. V  
 14 post pedibus add. cuiusmodi est poetica V 15 supponitur] -posita V 16 vero om. V  
 ista] hec V 17 sit causa efficiens] est causa est effectus V accentus] autem V  
 18 accentibus] articularibus C 20 uidetur quia] subiectum ostenditur sic V debet] oportet  
 V 23 nec<sup>1</sup> sit sermo] non fit primo C 25 unde...est] et dicendum C vel] siue V

5. Ad hoc vero quod obicitur de titulo [2], dicendum quod sumitur ibi accentus secundum quod concernit accentuable, et non in abstractione, unde idem est dictu esse *De accentibus* quod esse de eo cui inest accentus.

- 30 6. Habito ergo de quo est hec scientia, dicendum est quomodo est de illo, et hoc est dicere causam formalem huius scientie. Sciendum igitur quod causa formalis consistit in modo agendi et ordinandi: in modo ordinandi secundum quod una pars ordinatur ante aliam; modus vero agendi est diffinitivus (diffinit enim accentum) et diuisivus, quia eundem diuidit, et exemplorum suppositivus (ponit  
35 enim exempla de notulis accentuum) collectivus in parte, quia probat vocem esse corpus.

7. Hoc habito, dicendum est ad quid siue propter quid sit hec scientia. Dicendum ergo quod est propter recte pronunciari. Ad hoc enim quod recte intelligatur quod profertur, oportet quod recte pronunciatur. Cum ergo grammatica  
40 sit ad hoc quod recte intelligatur quod profertur, ut habetur in *Topicis*, oportet quod sit hec scientia per quam recte pronunciatur; set scientia docens legem et regulam eleuandi et deprimendi est huiusmodi: quare, cum scientia hic tradita sit huiusmodi, quod patet ex ratione accentus, finis huius scientie erit recte pronun-  
ciari.

- 45 8. Causa vero efficiens fuit Priscianus. Titulus talis est: *Incipit liber Prisciani De accentibus*.

9. Dubitatur hic: cum in eadem scientia in qua determinatur de subiecto conueniens sit determinare et de accidente eiusdem; cum ergo in orthographia determinetur de sillaba, in eadem esset determinandum de accentu, cum sit per se  
50 accidens sillabe.

10. Preterea, cum spiritus et numerus litterarum accidant sillabe sicut accentus et tempus; non est autem scientia separata ab ethimologia in qua determinatur de spiritu vel numero litterarum: ergo nec similiter erit scientia separata in qua determinetur de accentu vel de tempore sicut poetica.

- 55 11. Ad primum [9] dicendum est quod duplex est causa quare non determinatur de accentu, siue de accidente, in eadem scientia in qua determinatur de subiecto. Vna est quod non complete cognoscitur quale debeat esse illud accidens nisi per partem posteriorem totalis scientie vel per alteram scientiam penitus.

40-41 Arist., *Top.* 4.1 (121b3-4).

41-42 cf. *De acc.* II.5 (p. 519.25-26).

27 vero om. C 30 hec] hic V 33 aliam] alteram V 35 exempla de notulis]  
exemplum (deinde spatium trium verborum) V 37 siue] et V sit] est V 39 ergo  
om. C 41 docens] determinans V 41-42 et regulam] et naturam C: rectam etc. causa V  
42 est] et C huiusmodi] materia V 43 finis om. C 45 fuit] est V post est add.  
hic V post liber add. siue V 49 determinandum] -nare V 51 accidant] -dunt V  
53 spiritu vel om. V erit] est C 54 determinetur] -natur C 56 siue corr. ex secundum  
C de accidente om. V 57 post subiecto add. quarum V 58 per<sup>1</sup> om. V

Primo modo se habet accentus, secundo modo tempus. Non enim complete  
 60 cognoscitur qualis debeat esse accentus nisi per dictionem et significationem  
 dictionis: quod enim interiectiones non habent certum accentum, hoc significationi  
 earum debetur. Item, quod prepositiones grauantur in omnibus sillabis debetur  
 significationi earum. Et ita non cognoscitur complete qualis debeat esse accentus  
 nisi per significationem dictionis et per dictionem. Dictio vero est posterior pars  
 65 grammaticae quam sillaba et subiectum posterioris scientie, que subalternatur  
 grammaticae sicut ethimologia, et propterea est scientia separata in qua determi-  
 natur / de accentu. Similiter vero proportio temporum et numerus pedum quoad C 22rb  
 causas sui sunt de consideratione artis metrice. Item, quare versus constant ex sex  
 pedibus vel quinque tantum, ars metrica habet determinare causam, eo scilicet quod  
 70 numerus senarius et quinaris sunt numeri circulares. Et ita non cognoscitur  
 tempus complete nisi mediante alia scientia a grammatica, et propterea est scientia  
 separata de tempore, que in parte subalternatur grammaticae, in parte autem alteri  
 scientie. Et ita patet primum obiectum, eo quod de accidente cuius cognitio  
 dependet solum a subiecto determinandum est in eadem scientia in qua determina-  
 75 tur de subiecto. Non autem sic est de accidente cuius cognitio dependet a  
 posteriori quam sit subiectum vel ab altero. Talia autem accidentia sunt accentus  
 et tempus.

12. Ad secundum [10] dicendum quod littera, siue sillaba, ex se in sua  
 pronuntiatione determinat spiritum asperum et lenem; similiter, sillaba ex se  
 80 numerum litterarum determinat: et propterea non consistit tanta variatio circa  
 litteras et sillabas penes spiritum et numerum litterarum quanta circa tempus et  
 accentum, et propterea non est tantus error circa easdem, scilicet penes accentum  
 et tempus, et propterea est ars et scientia separata in qua determinatur de accentu  
 vel de tempore, non autem de spiritu et numero litterarum.

### <LECTIO 1>

13. LITTERA EST NOTA ELEMENTI, etc. (I.1; 519.2) Iste liber totus prima  
 diuisione diuiditur in duas partes: in quarum prima determinat de subiecto  
 accentus, sicut de sillaba; in secunda, que sic incipit, SET NOS LOCUTURI, etc. (I.4;  
 5 519.22-23), vel ibi, ACCENTUS NAMQUE, etc. (II.5; 519.25), determinat de accentu.

59 tempus] spiritus V	62 earum] eorum V	69 ars metrica] arimeticus CV	eo
scilicet] eo (corr. ex ad) C	70 numerus om. V	et <sup>1</sup> ] vel C	ita] ideo V
72 alteri] alii C	73 eo om. V	cuius cognitio] a cuius cognitione C	80 et
propterea] preterea V	82 accentum <sup>1</sup> corr. ex accidens V	non est tantus error] unus error	
est V	easdem] eadem C	penes om. V	83 ars] ante V
			84 vel om. V
Lectio 1	2-3 totus...diuisione om. V	3 quarum om. C	subiecto] substantia V

14. Et prima istarum diuiditur et multiplicatur hoc modo. Intendit enim in illa manifestare subiectum ipsius accentus, quod est sillaba; et quia elementum est pars sillabe, et ad hoc quod cognoscatur totum necesse est cognoscere partes, ad hoc quod cognoscatur sillaba oportet ut cognoscatur elementum: et quia littera est nota  
 10 elementi, et notatum cognoscitur per notam, ideo ad cognitionem elementi oportet cognoscere litteram. Propterea, diuiditur hec pars in quatuor partes: in quarum prima manifestat quid sit littera; in secunda, que sic incipit, SET CUM EX SONO (I.1; 519.4), manifestat quid est elementum et qualiter littera est eius ymago, et hoc primo in se, deinde in suo genere, cum dicit, VOX NAMQUE CORPUS, etc. (I.2;  
 V 105ra 15 519.6-7), quia vox est genus / ad elementum; in tertia parte, que sic incipit, HABENT ETIAM SILLABE, etc. (I.3; 519.11-12), manifestat sillabam, ostendendo quid sit eius principium et differentiam eius ad elementa quantum ad eius principium; in quarta vero parte, que sic incipit, DISTAT AUTEM ILLUD, etc. (I.3; 519.16), comparat ipsa elementa ad litteras, ostendendo eorum differentias, et consequen-  
 20 ter, cum dicit, VIDENTUR AUTEM LITTERE, etc. (I.4; 519.20), comparat elementa ad sillabas in pronuntiacione, ad figuras representantes eas, et etiam litteras et sillabas et dictiones et orationes in scripto inter se comparat. Et sic patet sententia in generali.

15. In speciali sic procedit dicens, LITTERA EST NOTA ELEMENTI (I.1; 519.2), hec  
 25 est figura elementi, que littera cum in scripto sit, et non sit sonus vel vox, nichil aliud est quam similitudo ad formandum elementum in pronuntiacione. Et hoc est quod dicit ibi, LITTERA EST NOTA, etc.

16. Consequenter manifestat et qualiter eius nota est littera et per consequens quid sit elementum, dicens quod cum sit proruptio a sono, qui solum potentia est  
 30 vox, in vocem actu, illa vox appellatur *elementum*. Et addit quod, cum diffinitio *littere* que est nota sit illa que dicta est, iam patet quod littera que est nota est ymago elementi quod est vox exiens in pronuntiacione. Et hoc probat sic: vox constat enim ex aere percusso ictu lingue; set aer percussus ictu lingue formatur et figuratur; ergo vox que generatur per percussionem aeris simili figura formatur et  
 35 figuratur; ergo oportet quod habeat in scripto figuram similem corespondentem, et hec est littera; quare littera (dico que est in scripto) erit nota, siue ymago, uocis. Et hoc est quod dicit, SET CUM EX SONO, etc. (I.1; 519.4)

6 enim] autem V	8 cognoscatur] -camus V	9 ut cognoscatur] cognoscere V
10 ideo om. V	11 partes om. V	12 sit] est V
13 sillabe] sillaba C	17 sit] est V	18 habent] habens (?) C: hinc V
14 corr. ex ista C: ille V	eius <sup>2</sup> om. C	16 vero om. V
15 etiam om. V	21 eorum] earum V	17 illud om. C
24 procedit dicens corr. ex pro diuisiones C	21 representantes eas] representans ipsas V	19 ipsa
26 in om. C	22 elementi] etc. V	20 que
27 ibi om. V	23 et...eius] cuiusmodi V	21 qui
32 sic om. V	24 solum] in sonum V	22 qui
34 figuratur] finitur V	32 erit] est C	23 quod dicit om. C
35 figuratur] finitur V		



17. Consequenter ostendit quid sit elementum et quid littera in suo genere, quod est vox. Quia enim dixit quod vox informatur per ictum lingue, et hoc non fieret nisi vox esset corpus, ostendit quod vox sit corpus tali argumento: nichil tangit vel percutit auditum nisi corpus; set vox tangit et percutit auditum; ergo est corpus. Et hoc est quod dicit, VOX NAMQUE CORPUS, etc. (1.2; 519.6-7)

18. Deinde ponit aliud ad idem: omne quod mensuratur longitudine et latitudine et profunditate / est corpus; set vox sic mensuratur; ergo est corpus. C 22va  
45 Minorem huius ostendit dicens quod vox habet altitudinem in accentu, et latitudinem in spiritu, et longitudinem in tempore. Et hoc est quod dicit, SET CUM TANGIT AUDITUM, etc. (1.2; 519.8)

19. Consequenter ostendit quid sillaba sit quantum ad suum principium, dicens quod sillaba est cuius principium est productio. Deinde assignat differentiam inter sillabam et litteram quoad sua principia, dicens quod pronuntiatio est elementum, et hoc est principium littere; productio vero est principium sillabe. Et hoc ostendit, scilicet quod principium littere est pronuntiatio, sic: cuiuslibet vocis principium est pronuntiatio et sumatur *pronuntiatio* communiter set elementum est vox, siue littera, in pronuntiatione; ergo ipsius principium est pronuntiatio.  
55 Minorem huius ostendit sic interrogando, QUID ENIM EST ELEMENTUM ALIUD, etc.? (1.3; 519.14-15), quasi dicens, quicquid est pars vocis significative composite est vox; set elementum, siue littera, est huiusmodi in pronuntiatione, quia est minima pars vocis, etc.; ergo constat quod elementum est vox. Et addit quod illud quod permanet post vocem, que successiva est in elemento, est figura in scripto, notans  
60 elementum in pronuntiatione. Et hoc est quod dicit, HABET ETIAM SILLABA SUUM, etc. (1.3; 519.11-12)

20. Consequenter assignat differentiam littere et elementi, dicens quod ipse voces pronuntiate sunt elementa; note autem ipsarum in scripto sunt littere. Dicit tamen quod, abutendo nominibus, utuntur communiter *litteris* pro *elementis* et  
65 econverso in loquendo. Et probat quod bene assignavit differentiam, quia diuersum est illud quod a sensu videtur in scripto proprie loquendo et illud quod per talem figuram intelligendum est, quod scilicet est vox ipsa. Et hoc est quod dicit, DISTAT AUTEM ILLUD INTER ELEMENTUM (1.3; 519.16).

21. Consequenter, comparando litteras et sillabas, dictiones et orationes,  
70 secundum quod sunt in scripto, dicit quod quedam littere visuales sunt longe, et

39 *De acc.* 1.1 (p. 519.6).

38 sit *om. C*    quid<sup>2</sup> *om. V*    45 minorem] maiorem *C*    quod *om. V*    46 quod dicit  
*om. C*    48 sillaba...quantum] sit sillaba quo *V*    52 pronuntiatio] enun- *V*    55 minorem  
huius] maiorem *C*    56 significative] -vo *C*    57 quia est] quare et *V*    59 notans] notant  
*V*: vocans *C*    60 quod dicit *om. C*    65 assignavit] -nat *V*    67 intelligendum] -genda *V*  
quod...est<sup>1</sup>] scilicet quod *C*    quod dicit *om. C*    68 illud...elementum] inter elementum  
*C*: illud etc. *V*    70 visuales] usuales *V*

quedam late — et hoc verum est de omnibus, diuersimode considerando earum dimensiones — et quedam rotunde, sicut *o*, et quedam quadrate, sicut *m* et *n*. Et dicit quod ex litteris visualibus in scripto, scilicet in sillabas collectis, et deinde ex sillabis in partes, et deinde ex partibus, siue dictionibus, in orationes, narratur tota

75 aliqua res gesta. Et hec pars incipit ibi, VIDENTUR AUTEM LITTERE, etc. (1.4; 519.20) Et sic terminatur hec pars que est de subiecto ipsius accentus.

22. Dubitari autem potest de hiis que dicit in littera: primo, utrum quilibet sonus, siue quelibet vox, possit esse litterata sicut elementum; secundo, qualiter littera sit ymago elementi; tertio, de eo quod ostendit vocem esse corpus; quarto, 80 de eo quod dicit quod productio est elementum sillabe, elementum vero litterarum ipse pronuntiationes.

23. De primo sic dubitatur: vox litterata est illa que representabilis est per figuras in scripto; quelibet vox est representabilis in scripto per figuram; ergo quelibet vox est litterata. Potest enim fieri in scripto figura representans siue notans 85 quamlibet vocem.

24. Ad hoc [23] dicendum quod non quelibet vox representabilis per figuram est litterata set que est representabilis per similem figuram in scripto qualem in sui formatione habet in aere, et propterea non oportet quod quelibet vox sit litterata.

25. Consequenter igitur queritur, cum tria sint necessaria ad generationem 90 vocis siue soni, scilicet verberans et verberatum et illud ad quod verberatur; verberatum vero est aer; aer vero male est terminabile termino proprio, bene vero alieno; ergo aer in verberatione consequitur figuram eius ad quod fit verberatio vel verberantis aut utriusque; ergo, cum in generatione cuiuslibet soni fit talis verberatio aeris, quilibet sonus habebit figuram in aere cui potest respondere consimilis 95 figura in scripto; ergo quilibet sonus est representans per figuram consimilem in scripto qualem habet in aere: quare videtur quod quilibet sonus est litteratus.

26. Ad hoc [25] dicendum quod ad hoc quod sonus sit litteratus, siue vox litterata, oportet quod habeat figuram in aere, et regularem, aliter enim non est representabilis figura consimili in scripto regulariter, et ita non sufficit figuratio in 100 aere ad hoc quod vox sit representabilis figura consimili in scripto siue sonus. Ad hoc autem quod vox siue sonus habeat regularem figuram in aere exigitur verberans regulare et verberatum regulare et illud ad quod verberatur. Hoc autem est in

77-78 *De acc.* 1.1 (p. 519.2-3).

78-79 *ibid.* (p. 519.5).

79 *ibid.* 1.2 (p. 519.6-11).

79-80 *ibid.* 1.3 (p. 519.11-14).

73 visualibus] usualibus *V* 75 aliqua] alia *C* 77 primo *om. C* 78 possit] potest *V*  
79 sit] est *V* ostendit] dicit *V* 83 quelibet...figuram *om. C* 84 post siue *add.* que  
fuerit *V* 86 non *om. V* 89 igitur *om. C* sint necessaria] sunt *V* 91 vero<sup>2</sup>...est<sup>2</sup>] *genera-*  
autem est materie (?) *V* 93 verberantis...utriusque] verberatum vel utrumque *V* *tionem]* genere *V*  
95 representans] -tabilis est *V* 97 quod<sup>1</sup> *om. C* 98 est] fit *V*  
100 vox sit] fuerit *V* consimili] -lis *V* 102 et<sup>1</sup>...regulare *om. C*

rationabilibus maxime. Est enim ibi verberans regulare sicut anima sensibilis mota  
 ab anima / rationali siue instrumentum motum ab anima sensibili secundum quod C 22vb  
 105 regulatur ab anima rationali. Item, est verberatum regulare sicut aer attenuatus et  
 calefactus per calorem intra, ita quod est maxime conueniens et habilis ad figuram  
 vocis recipiendam. Iterum, istud ad quod fit verberatio est regulare sicut vocalis  
 arteria; potest enim dilatari et constringi, incuruari et extendi, secundum quod  
 exigitur ad vocis litterationem. Ista autem desunt in generatione soni qui prouenit  
 110 ex concussione inanimatorum adinuicem; non enim sunt hec tria ibi regulariter se  
 habentia ut iam dictum est. Simili modo desunt ista in generatione vocis que  
 profertur a brutis. Non enim est ibi anima rationalis regulans / virtutem sensibilem V 105rb  
 ut est mouens instrumentum ad generationem vocis. Item, ipsa instrumenta  
 formantia non sunt ita applicabilia neque habilia ad dilationem, constrictionem et  
 115 incuruationem et extensionem sicut in rationabilibus, et propterea in generatione  
 vocis prolata ab eis non est derelicta regularis figura in aere secundum quam fiat  
 vox litterata et representabilis simili figura in scripto.

27. Consequenter vero dubitatur de hoc quod dicit quod littera est ymago  
 elementi. 'Ymago enim est cuius generatio est per imitationem' alterius, sicut  
 120 habetur in sexto *Topicorum* versus principium; ergo littera in scripto fit per  
 imitationem elementi in pronuntiatione: ergo elementum in pronuntiatione  
 habebit talem figuram qualem habet littera in scripto et econuerso; ergo cum similis  
 sit formatio cuiuslibet elementi apud omnes et quasi eadem, eo quod instrumenta  
 sunt similia et eadem specie, sic eadem figura specie esset nota elementi eiusdem  
 125 speciei apud omnes. Quod videtur falsum, eo quod alia figura specie est repre-  
 sentans hoc apud Latinos, et alia apud Grecos.

28. Preterea, videtur quod vox non possit habere figuram, et ita littera non  
 possit esse eius ymago. Omne enim habens figuram est habens positionem partium,  
 eo quod figura consequitur ad quantitatem habentem positionem in partibus sicut  
 130 rectitudo vel curvitas; set vox, cum sit successiua, non habebit positionem in  
 partibus: ergo vox non potest habere figuram, et ita littera non potest esse ymago  
 elementi secundum figuram.

118-119 *De acc.* i.1 (p. 519.5).

119-120 Arist., *Top.* 6.2 (140a14-15).

103 ibi *om.* V 107 iterum] item C 108 incuruari] aut curuari V 109 litterationem]  
 litteram V desunt] desinit C generatione] genere V 110 ibi] ita V 113 ipsa] ista C  
 114 constrictionem] -struct- V 117 representabilis] reprehensibilis V 119 imitatio-  
 nem] mutacionem C: inmutacionem V sicut] ut V 120 sexto...principium] principio sexti  
 topicorum V 121 imitationem] imutationem (inmu- V) CV pronuntiatione<sup>2</sup>] enuntiatione  
 V 122-123 similis...formatio] consimilis formatio sit V 124 similia] cons- V 125 spe-  
 ciei] specie CV videtur] vidimus V 127 preterea] propterea C 128 possit esse] erit  
 V 129 consequitur] se- C 129-131 sicut...partibus *om.* V 131 post figuram *add.* in  
 partibus V littera *om.* V

29. Ad primum [27] dicendum quod *idem* dicitur multipliciter, scilicet vel secundum substantiam, vel secundum accidens. Similiter, *figura eadem specie* potest esse dupliciter, vel quod sit eadem specie accidentaliter, vel substantialiter. Figura eadem specie substantialiter representat hoc elementum *a* apud omnes, et similiter alia elementa; non autem eadem figura specie accidentaliter. Diuersificatur enim magnitudine et paruitate siue protractione aliqua accidentali, sicut patet in figura magna eius quod est *A* apud nos et figura parua; saluatur enim figura parua substantialiter in figura magna. Similiter, figura elementi apud nos saluatur in figura eiusdem elementi apud alios; diuersificatur tamen ab eadem accidentaliter. Vel potest dici quod intelligitur de littera que est nota elementi per figuram regularem — et dico figuram regularem que regulariter formatur iuxta figuram quam habet uox in aere cum generatur. Vnde, licet apud aliquos fiat littera nota uocis, siue elementi, sicut figura irregularis, non oportet quod fuerit ymago elementi, nec quod fuerit similis figura in aere qualis in scripto.

30. Ad secundum [28] dicendum est quod successium de se non habet figuram; habet tamen per accidens figuram, sicut mediante subiecto in quo est, quod habet positionem partium. Vnde dicit Aristotiles quod motus sequitur figuram magnitudinis. Vnde motus circularis debetur corpori circulari, et motus rectus corpori recto. Et ita motus, licet de se sit successium, recipit tamen permanentiam et figuram mediante eo in quo est. Simili modo dicendum quod vox, licet de se sit successiua, potest tamen recipere figuram mediante aere in quo est et generatur.

31. Consequenter, secundo, queritur de eo quod ostendit vocem esse corpus. Dicit enim Aristotiles in *Topicis*, considerandum est si similiter se habet in uno sensu et in alio: ut si obiectum visus est qualitas, et obiectum auditus; set obiectum visus est qualitas, sicut color, / ergo et obiectum auditus. Cum ergo tam vox quam sonus fuerit obiectum auditus, tam vox quam sonus erit qualitas.

32. Item, dicit Aristotiles in libro *De anima* quod inmutatium sensus particularis, siue sensatum ab eo, est passibilis qualitas: vox ergo erit passibilis qualitas, cum fuerit proprie inmutans auditum.

33. Preterea, si vox esset corpus, cum eadem vox numero peruenit ad aures diuersorum simul et semel, eo quod simul et semel auditur a diuersis, ergo idem

149-151 cf. Arist., *Cael.* 1.2 (268b25-26) et *Ph.* 4.11 (219a12-13). 155 *De acc.* 1.2 (p. 519.6-7). 156-157 Arist., *Top.* 1.14 (105b5-10). 160-161 Arist., *De an.* 2.5 (416b33-35).

133 scilicet vel *om.* C 135 eadem] idem C 137 diuersificatur] -cantur V 145 irregularis] regulari C 152 et figuram mediante] ab C 153 de se *om.* V 155 secundo *om.* V 157-158 et<sup>2</sup>...qualitas *om.* C 158 ergo...auditus *corr. ex* et obiectum auditus C 159 fuerit] fiunt V 161 eo] ipso V erit] est C 163 preterea] propterea C

165 corpus numero simul et semel esset in diuersis locis: quod falsum est; ergo vox non est corpus.

34. Ad hec [31-33] dicendum est quod sicut rectum et curuum multipliciter possunt considerari, scilicet vel prout notant qualitatem solam, non significando subiectum in quo est qualitas, et hoc modo idem est rectum quod rectitudo in  
 170 subiecto, curuum idem est quod curuitas in subiecto, et sic sunt qualitates in predicamento qualitatis tantum, et hoc modo sumendo album et dicitur quod album est species coloris, hoc est albedo in subiecto; alio modo potest sumi rectum et curuum secundum quod concernunt subiectum in quo sunt et significant illud, et hoc modo curuum est idem quod res curuitatem habens et ut hoc ipsum res  
 175 supponat subiectum. Set possunt concernere subiectum duobus modis: vel subiectum immediatum quod est quantitas, et sic curuum et rectum possunt dici quantitates; vel subiectum mediatum quod est corpus siue substantia, et sic potest utrumque dici *corpus*. Similiter dicendum est de voce quod vox potest sumi secundum quod non concernit subiectum in quo est, et sic est qualitas tantum; vel  
 180 secundum quod concernit subiectum in quo est, ita quod illud subiectum cadat in significatione huius nominis *vox*. Set potest concernere subiectum immediatum tantum, et sic est quantitas (subiectum enim immediatum quod concernit vox est quantitas aeris) vel potest concernere subiectum mediatum vocis, quod est aer, et sic est corpus. Et ita patent duo primo obiecta [31-32].

185 35. Solutio tertii [33] patet ex *Libro sex principiorum*, quod vox, scilicet primo generata, non peruenit ad aures diuersorum set vox ymaginabiliter generata, que scilicet generatur ad ymaginem eius et est species eius, sicut color non recipitur in visu set species coloris. Vox enim est in aere primo figurato sicut in subiecto; ille vero aer, eo quod undique contingit verberans et illud ad quod verberatur, cum  
 190 sit male terminabile termino proprio, undique figuratur: unde, cum mouetur aer, missus extra, mouet aera sibi proximum undique et figurat illum consimili figura qua figuratur. Item, aer secundo motus et figuratus undique mouet aera sibi continuum et figurat illum consimili figura, et sic deinceps donec peruenit ad

185-186 *Liber sex principiorum* 5 'De ubi' (Aristoteles Latinus 1/6-7.46:10-19).

---

167 multipliciter *om. V* 168 prout notant *corr. ex prout* vocant *C*: pro ut nominant *V*  
 significando] considerando *V* 169 quod] et *V* 170 subiecto<sup>1</sup>] substantia *V* idem *om.*  
*V* 171 album] albedo *V* 175 set] sic *C* duobus modis] et modum *V* 176 quantitas]  
 qualitas *C* 177 quantitates] qualitates *C* sic] ita *V* 178 post voce *add.* secundum *C*  
 179 tantum] solum *V* 181 set] vel *C* 182 tantum...quantitas *om. V* quantitas] qualitas  
*C* enim] scilicet *V* concernit] *lac. in V* 183 quantitas] qualitas (*corr. ex quantitas*) *C*  
 vel...concernere] corpus *V* vocis...aer] aer tantum *V* 184 post est *add.* quantitas vel  
 mediatum et sic est *V* patent] procedunt *C* primo] prima *C* 185 ex] exemplo *V* scilicet  
*om. V* 186 peruenit] pro- *V* 187 generatur...species] ad speciem *V* 188 in<sup>3</sup>] et *C*  
 191 aera] aerem *C* 193 figurat] -ra *V* peruenit] perueniatur *V*

auditum et cesset violentia. Ex hoc autem est hoc quod vox auditur undique et que  
 195 peruenit ad aures diuersorum non que primo generatur set species eius vel est ei  
 consimilis.

36. Consequenter dubitatur de hoc quod dicit quod productio est elementum  
 sillabe, et pronuntiatio elementum littere. Productio vero est differentia temporis  
 — diuiditur enim tempus per productum et correptum — set tempus accidit sillabe,  
 200 ergo et productio; set quod accidit sillabe non est eius elementum siue principium;  
 ergo productio non est elementum sillabe.

37. Preterea, ex quo productio accidit littere sicut et sillabe, non ponitur  
 autem elementum littere; ergo eadem ratione nec sillabe.

38. Ad primum [36] dicendum quod productio uno modo est differentia  
 205 temporis, et sic nichil aliud est quam extensio more pronuntiandi sillabam siue  
 V 105va duplicatio more que sufficit ad hoc quod pronuntietur sillaba, / ita quod minor non  
 possit sufficere, et tunc non est elementum sillabe set accidens; alio vero modo  
 dicitur productio pronuntiatio siue motus habens completum accentum et spiri-  
 tum, mediante quo generatur sillaba, et productio hoc modo est elementum sillabe  
 210 sicut generatio est principium generati.

39. Ex hoc patet secundum [37], quod quia productio hoc modo non  
 conuenit littere, set pronuntiatio siue motus habens incompletum tempus, accen-  
 C 23rb tum et spiritum, ideo non dicitur eius elementum. /

40. Item, assignando differentias inter elementa et litteras, dicit quod *elementa*  
 215 *sunt ipse pronuntiationes*; ergo pronuntiatio est idem quod elementum: ergo, cum  
 idem non sit principium sui ipsius, pronuntiatio non erit principium littere que est  
 elementum.

41. Preterea, in orthographia dicit quod pronuntiatio est potestas pronun-  
 tiandi; et potestas pronuntiandi accidit littere: ergo non est eius principium.

220 42. Ad primum [40] dicendum quod *pronuntiatio* dicitur uno modo ipsum  
 pronuntiatum, et sic littera que est elementum est pronuntiatio, nec hoc modo est  
 pronuntiatio eius principium. Alio vero modo dicitur *pronuntiatio* modus pro-  
 nuntiandi substantialis et accidentalis: substantialis secundum quod bene potest  
 facere vocem per se, et iste idem est quod potestas substantialis littere. Accidental-  
 225 is modus est modus pronuntiandi sub correptione et productione, etc., et iste idem

214 *De acc.* l.3 (p. 519.12-14).

218-219 Prisc., *Inst. gramm.* 1.8 (GL 2.9:2).

194 autem *om. C* hoc<sup>2</sup> *om. C* que *om. C* 195 peruenit] pro- CV generatur]  
 figuratur C 198 vero] enim V 203 eadem] simili V 205 quam] quod V more]  
 in ore scilicet C 206 more] in ore (?) C pronuntietur] -atur (*corr. ex -atum*) C 207 tunc]  
 sic V 213 ideo...elementum *om. V* 216 idem *om. V* 218 preterea] propterea C  
 219 et potestas] potestas autem V eius *om. V* 220 dicitur] dicit C 222 vero *om. C*  
 223 bene] littera V 224 substantialis *om. V*

est quod potestas que accidit littere. Tertio modo dicitur pronuntiatio motus habens incompletum spiritum et accentum, secundum quem pronuntiatur littera que est elementum siue generatur, et pronuntiatio hoc modo est principium littere sicut generatio principium generati. Primo vero modo est idem quod littera, et sic  
 230 procedit prima obiectio [40]; secundo vero modo est proprietas littere, et sic procedit secunda obiectio [41].

## &lt;LECTIO 2&gt;

43. SET NOS LOQUTURI, etc. (I.4; 519.22-23) Postquam determinauit auctor de subiecto ipsius accentus, hic incipit determinare de ipso accentu. Et diuiditur hec pars in duas partes: in quarum prima manifestat suam intentionem; in secunda  
 5 exsequitur de intentis cum dicit, ACCENTUS NAMQUE, etc. (II.5; 519.25)

44. Et hec ultima diuiditur in tres: in quarum prima manifestat quid sit accentus; in secunda parte manifestat in qua parte dictionis fieri habet accentus cum dicit, NOTANDUM ETIAM QUOD ACCENTUS (II.7; 520.17); in tertia determinat regulas cognoscendi accentus in tali parte dictionis cum dicit, SILLABA QUE CORREPTAM  
 10 VOCALEM HABET, etc. (II.10; 521.5)

45. Item, prima istarum diuiditur in duas: in quarum prima manifestat accentum per diffinitionem; in secunda per diuisionem cum dicit, QUI ETIAM TRIPERTITO DIVIDITUR (II.5; 519.27).

46. Et hec ultima pars diuiditur in duas partes: in quarum prima ponit  
 15 diuisionem ipsius accentus proprie dicti; in secunda ponit diuisionem eiusdem communiter dicti cum dicit, SUNT AUTEM ACCENTUS DECEM (II.5; 520.3). Prima istarum partium diuiditur in duas: primo ponit diuisionem; deinde manifestat diuidentia. Pars autem in qua manifestat diuidentia ultime diuisionis, que incipit ibi, QUID EST ACCENTUS, etc., diuiditur in decem partes iuxta quod decem sunt  
 20 accentus, quos describendo omnes ostendit, monstrando figuras singulorum.

47. In speciali sic procedit, dicens quod accentus est certa lex et certa regula deprimendi et eleuandi quamcumque sillabam cuiuscumque dictionis que est pars orationis, et iste fit ad similitudinem elementorum, que sunt littere, et sillabarum.

Lectio 2      18-19 cf. *De acc.* II.5 (p. 519 n. ad lin. 24).

---

230 proprietas] inpro- V  
 Lectio 2      3 ipso om. V      4 partes om. V      5 exsequitur] exemplificat V      7 parte<sup>1</sup>  
 om. V      9 accentus] -tum V      cum] ubi V      12-13 triperito] inper- V      14 partes om.  
 V      16 autem om. C      prima] utraque V      17 primo ponit] partes iuxta quod ponit primo  
 C      19 quid] que V      diuiditur...iuxta] in III partes X<sup>a</sup> V      20 monstrando] manifestando  
 C      21 et...regula om. C      22 et] vel V      quamcumque] quamlibet V      cuiuscumque]  
 cuiuslibet V

Et hoc est sic intelligendum quod sicut littera est quoddam incompletum respectu  
 25 sillabe, et sillaba respectu dictionis, sic accentus littere est incompletus respectu  
 accentus sillabe, et tempus eius respectu temporis illius. Et hoc est quod dicit, AD  
 SIMILITUDINEM, etc. (II.5; 519.26)

48. Consequenter diuidit accentum proprie dictum, dicens quod accentus  
 quidam grauis, quidam acutus, quidam circumflexus. Et manifestat statim diui-  
 30 dentia, ostendens ad quid sit inuentus acutus accentus, scilicet ut eleuet sillabam,  
 et ad quid grauis, et ad quid circumflexus. Littera vero plana est. Et hoc est quod  
 dicit, QUI ETIAM TRIPERITTO, etc. (II.5; 519.27)

49. Consequenter diuidit accentum communiter dictum, dicens quod accentus  
 sunt decem, et enumerat eos statim; quibus enumeratis, exsequitur dicens quid sit  
 35 unusquisque. Et explanatio cuiuslibet descriptionis, si opus fuerit, dicitur inferius.

50. Circa iam dicta incidunt dubitationes, et primo circa diffinitionem accen-  
 tus; secundo, circa utramque diuisionem per ordinem. Circa diffinitionem sic  
 dubitatur: dicit quod *accentus est certa lex et certa regula ad eleuandum et*  
*deprimendum*, etc.; queritur utrum iste dictiones, scilicet *lex* et *regula*, sumantur hic  
 40 in sua propria significatione vel transumptiue. Si in significatione propria, tunc est  
 diffinitio ista falsa. Probatio: dicit Tullius quod *lex* est ius scriptum, assistens  
 honestum, prohibens contrarium; set istud est falsum de accentu; quare false  
 C 23va dicitur quod accentus sit *lex*, proprie sumendo / *legem*.

51. Item, *regula* secundum quod est in arte liberali dicitur propositio generalis,  
 45 siue maxima, rectificans operationem secundum artem; set illud est falsum de  
 accentu: quare proprie sumendo *regulam*, falso dicitur quod accentus sit *regula*.

52. Si autem dicatur quod ista nomina hic sumantur translatiue, tunc peccat  
 diffinitio per considerationem *Topicorum*: si aliquid eorum que ponuntur in  
 diffinitione translatiue sit dictum, peccatur.

50 53. Ad hec [50-52] dicendum dupliciter. Primo sic, scilicet quod ista nomina  
 translatiue dicuntur in assignata diffinitione. Ad hoc autem quod obicitur per  
 considerationem *Topicorum* [52], concedendum est quod ista diffinitio peccat  
 quantum ad illam diffinitionem que intenditur determinari in *Topicis*. Illa enim est  
 diffinitio in optimo statu; hec autem non est talis set descriptio siue notificatio

35 vide infra, §§ 72-73. 38-39 *De acc.* II.5 (p. 519.25-26). 41-42 cf., e.g., Cic., *De leg.*  
 1.6.18-19 et *Phil.* 11.12.28. 48-49 Arist., *Top.* 4.3 (123a33-36). 52-53 *ibid.*

26 eius] est *V* (post eius *expunx.* est *C*) quod dicit] est (*per modum lemmatis*) *C* 30 sit]  
 est *V* 31 post grauis *add.* scilicet *C* 34 enumerat] numerat *C* enumeratis...quid]  
 numeratis exsequitur dicere quis *C*: enumeratis exemplo dicere quid *V* 39 scilicet *om.* *V*  
 40 sua *om.* *C* si in] sine *V* tunc] cui *V* 43 sit] est *C* 45 operationem] autem  
*V* illud] id *C* 46 falso] -se *CV* 47 autem] igitur *V* hic *om.* *V* 49 sit dictum]  
 dicuntur *V* peccatur] peccant *V* 51 translatiue dicuntur] transumuntur *V* obicitur]  
 obicit *C* 53 illam diffinitionem] illa *V*



55 quecumque per notiora. Vnde conuenit uti translatiue dictio, et hec aliquo modo notificat illud quod dat intelligere per similitudinem.

54. Aliter potest dici quod ista nomina, *regula* et *lex*, secundum primam inpositionem proprie ponuntur in diffinitione *accentus* hoc modo: *lex* primo inponitur ad significandum illud per quod vitatur inconueniens circa aliquid, et  
60 *regula* inponitur primo ad designandum illud per quod rectificatur conueniens circa aliquid. Et sic sumuntur ista nomina proprie, et secundum has significationes extendunt se ad accentum, et ita dicendum quod proprie in diffinitione *accentus* ponuntur. Consequenter autem translata sunt ista nomina ad illa significanda supra que fundatur obiectum. Transfertur enim hoc nomen *regula* ad significandum  
65 propositionem generalem per quam rectificatur artifex liberalis; et *lex* similiter transfertur ad significandum ius scriptum, assistens honestum, etc.: et sic sumendo ista inproprie et artando non conueniunt accentui, et sic processerunt obiectiones [50-51].

55. Consequenter dubitatur de hoc quod dicit *certa* in diffinitione. Videtur  
70 enim quod *accentus* non sit *certa* *lex* ad eleuandum et deprimendum omnem sillabam, etc. Dicit enim Priscianus quod prepositiones quando preponuntur suis casualibus grauantur per omnes sillabas, et quando postponuntur acuantur in principio. Vnde diuersum habent *accentus* cum preponuntur et postponuntur, et ita incertum. Vnde *accentus* / non est *certa* *lex* et *regula*, etc.

V 105vb

75 56. Item, dicit Priscianus quod interiectiones, eo quod proferuntur voce abscondita, non habent *accentus* certum: non ergo est *accentus* *certa* *lex* ad eleuandum et deprimendum sillabam unamquamque, etc.

57. Ad primum [55] dicendum est quod prepositiones habent certum *accen-*  
tum; quod patet per hoc quod non possunt nisi preponi vel postponi, et certum  
80 est quem *accentus* habent siue preponantur siue postponantur: unde non sequitur si habent diuersum *accentus* in preponendo et postponendo, ergo est incertum, set sequitur quod non habent *accentus* uniformem hinc et inde.

58. Ad secundum [56] dicendum est quod ista verba *eleuandum* et *deprimendum* sumuntur in predicta diffinitione habitualiter et non actualiter. Vnde sensus

69 *De acc.* II.5 (p. 519.25).71-73 Prisc., *Inst. gramm.* 14.2 (GL 3.24:21-22).75-76 *ibid.* 15.42 (GL 3.91:20-22).

55 notiora] notificantia (corr. ex notificabilia) C et] quod V 57 aliter] alio modo V post  
lex add. et regula C 59 inponitur] -nuntur C 59-61 et...aliquid om. C 63 significanda]  
-cata V supra] simpliciter C 64 fundatur obiectum] fundantur ratio obiecta V  
65 similiter] ista V 66 assistens corr. ex asciscens (al. man.) C: asciscens V 70 et] vel V  
71 enim om. C 74 et...etc. om. C 75 post interiectiones add. ex V 77 et] vel V  
unamquamque om. C 80 preponantur] -nuntur V postponantur] -nuntur V  
81 est] et V 82 sequitur quod non] sic C uniformem] in omni formacione C  
84 predicta] dicta V actualiter] accidentaliter V

85 est: accentus est certa lex ad eleuandum et deprimendum sillabam, et hoc est per quam nata est sillaba cuiuslibet dictionis siue partis orationis eleuari vel deprimi. Sic autem nata est quelibet sillaba interiectionis eleuari vel deprimi, licet non actu eleuetur vel deprimatur. Si enim interiectio sit monosyllaba habens uocalem breuem apta nata est acui; si autem longam, circumflecti, licet non sit ita actu propter hoc  
 90 quod notant ignotos affectus, ut dicit Priscianus. Si autem fuerit interiectio dissillaba vel trisillaba, et sic deinceps, nata est habere accentus secundum regulas datas de dissillabis, etc., licet non actu seruet accentus huiusmodi propter dictam causam.

59. Item, videtur quod tota ista diffinitio conueniat spiritui, et ita non erit  
 95 conuertibilis. Aspiratio enim, sicut dicit Priscianus, preponitur vocali ut eleuet eius sonum, postponitur autem consonanti ut deprimat eius sonum. Ergo aspiratio est certa lex eleuandi et deprimendi, etc.; set aspiratio est spiritus: quare spiritus est certa lex eleuandi et deprimendi, et hoc sillaba cuiuslibet dictionis, quia omnis sillaba aut aspero aut leni spiritu regulatur in proferendo.  
 100 60. Ad hoc [59] dicendum quod *accentus*, et similiter sua diffinitio, possunt sumi communiter et proprie: si communiter, sic comprehendit *accentus* sub se  
 C 23vb spiritum, et sic ei conuenit eius diffinitio; si proprie, sic non conuenit ei, / nec sic comprehendit sub se spiritum. Huius explanatio talis est. *Eleuatio* vocis et *depressio* dupliciter dicuntur, scilicet vel causate ex generatione ipsius vocis tantum, vel ex  
 105 sono extrinsecus adueniente siue defectu eiusdem. Primo modo fit eleuatio et depressio per accentum proprie, et sic sumitur hic diffinitio *accentus*. Secundo vero modo fit eleuatio et depressio per spiritum, quia aspiratio est sonus extrinsecus adueniens littere ut eleuet vel deprimat ipsam ad auditum. Additio enim eius ad uocalem ante eleuat eius sonum; ablatio vero eius a vocali ex parte ante causat  
 110 depressionem illius soni. Similiter additio aspirationis ex parte post cum consonante deprimat sonum eius; deficiente autem ibidem aspiratione, eleuatur eius sonus. Sic ergo patet responsio ad obiectum [59]; processit enim sumendo *eleuationem* et *depressionem* communiter, scilicet prout causantur a sono eius extrinsecus adueniente vel defectu eiusdem, vel ex generatione ipsius vocis tantum,

90 cf. *ibid.* 15.40 (GL 3.90:14-15).

95-96 cf. *ibid.* 1.24 (GL 2.18:18-20).

85 et<sup>1</sup>] vel *V* et<sup>2</sup>] etc. *V* per] secundum *V* 86 nata] nota *C* dictionis siue *om. V*  
 87 sic...licet *om. C* 88 sit *om. C* 89 autem longam] longa *V* 92 dissillabis etc.] sillabis  
 et ideo *C* huiusmodi *om. C* 92-93 propter...causam] secundum datam regulam *C* 94 tota  
*om. C* 97 set] licet *V* 98 post sillaba *add. or C* dictionis] etc. *V* 99 aut aspero]  
 aspiratio *V* regulatur] leuabitur *V* 101 sub se *om. V* 102 ei<sup>2</sup> *om. C* 103 spiritum]  
 ipsum *C* 104 ex generatione] uel (*s.s.*) secundum cognacionem *C*: ex generacio *V*  
 106 vero *om. C* 108 ad auditum *om. V* 109 vero] eius (*corr. ex ens al. man.*) *C*  
 111 deficiente] diffinite *V* 112 ergo *om. V* obiectum] -tionem *V* 113 causantur]  
 causatur *CV* a sono eius] ex no *V*

115 et sic verum est quod accentus continet spiritum, et sua diffinitio conuenit ei. Set  
sic non intenditur hic diffiniri; immo secundum propriam significationem *eleva-*  
*tionis* et *depressionis*, secundum quod proueniunt ex generatione ipsius vocis  
tantum, et sic non continet spiritum, nec sua diffinitio conuenit spiritui.

61. Consequenter queritur circa primam diuisionem accentus, quam ponit per  
120 acutum et grauem et circumflexum, hoc modo: accentus et tempus sunt accidentia  
sillabe; tempus autem est productum vel correptum; set ex compositione istorum  
non resultat tertia differentia temporis; quare videtur quod non debet constitui  
tertius accentus qui fiat ex acuto et graui, cuiusmodi est circumflexus.

62. Item, spiritus diuiditur per asperum et lenem sicut accentus per acutum et  
125 grauem: queritur igitur quare non sit tertia differentia spiritus, qui componatur ex  
aspero et leni, sicut est tertia differentia accentus, composita ex acuto et graui.

63. Item, cum ex compositione acuti et grauis fiat tertius accentus, prepo-  
nendo acutum in compositione et postponendo grauem (quia circumflexus incipit  
ab imo et tendit in altum et iterum descendit in imum, et ita incipit per acutum  
130 et terminatur per grauem) quare non fit quartus accentus proueniens ex compo-  
sitione acuti et grauis, ita quod grauis preponderetur et acutus postponderetur, qui  
inciperet ab alto et tenderet in imum et iterum tenderet in altum.

64. Ad primum [61] dicendum est quod tempus productum est quasi totum  
ad productum et correptum, et correptum quasi pars producti. Set si ex producto  
135 et correpto componatur tertium, illud adhuc erit totum ad correptum sicut et ipsum  
productum fuit, et ita adhuc cedit in productum, et ita non ponitur tertia differentia  
temporis que componatur ex producto et correpto. Acutus autem accentus et  
grauis sunt quasi oppositi, et neuter alterius est pars vel totum ad alterum; et ex  
oppositis, si conueniant in compositione, fit tertium quod est alterius rationis ab  
140 utroque: et propterea ex compositione acuti et grauis resultat tertius qui dicitur  
*circumflexus*. Quod autem ex compositione oppositorum proueniat tertium diuerse  
rationis ab utroque, manifestum est in commixtione extremorum coloris, scilicet  
albedinis et nigredinis: ipsa enim extrema opponuntur, et ex illis extremis oppositis  
fit medius color qui est alterius rationis quam aliquod aliorum extremorum.

145 65. Ad secundum [62] dicendum quod ex aspero et leni spiritu non est natum  
feri unum aliquod sicut ex acuto et graui accentu, et propterea non habet spiritus  
tertiam differentiam que sit composita sicut accentus habet. Huius autem ratio talis  
est. Asper spiritus, siue aspiratio, est incompletus sonus, quia in eius generatione

116 hic *om. C* 117 proueniunt] -nit *CV* 122 tertia] aliqua *V* 123 cuiusmodi] qui  
*V* 125 tertia...spiritus] tertius specie *C* 126 composita] -tus *V* 128 postponendo  
grauem] postposito grauo *V* 130 terminatur] diuiditur *C* 132 tenderet<sup>1</sup>] descenderet *V*  
tenderet<sup>2</sup>] tendetur *V* 134 productum *om. V* 138 oppositi] -ta *C* 139 conueniant]  
veni- *C* 142 manifestum] -tatum *V* coloris] -rum *V* 143 enim] tamen *C* extre-  
mis oppositis] compositis *V* 144 aliorum *om. V*

incipit aer frangi et figurari, set non complete frangitur et figuratur, et ex hoc quod

150 aliquo modo facit sonum, licet incomplete, habeat figuram in scripto. Spiritus  
autem lenis nec est sonus, nec aliquid de sono, nec determinat sonum circa

C 24ra litteram, quia omnis littera de se et naturaliter proferri habet leniter. / Vnde spiritus  
lenis tantummodo dicit modum rei, hoc est soni, et non rem; spiritus autem asper  
dicit rem in parte. Set ex modo rei et re ipsa non est natum aliquod componi, et

155 propterea ex hiis non resultat tertia differentia spiritus composita. In accentu vero  
gravi et acuto aliter est: neuter enim dicit sonum set modum circa sonum. Vnde,  
cum sint modi oppositi, ex hiis venientibus in compositione fit aliquod tertium  
diuerse rationis ab altero extremorum componentium, et exemplum manifestum  
est per albedinem et nigredinem, que sunt quasi modi rei et oppositi, et ex ipsarum

160 compositione resultat medius color qui est diuerse nature ab utroque extremorum.

66. Item, ad idem [62] potest assignari causa alia et solutio hoc modo. Dicit  
Aristotiles in secundo *De anima* quod inspirantem vel expirantem tantum in-  
possibile est vocare, hoc est vocem facere. Set spiritus solummodo fit in expira-  
tione aeris: quare, si ex spiritu leni et aspero componeretur spiritus tertius, fieret

V 106ra 165 forte nimia emissio ae/ris et sola emissio. Hoc autem esset contra bonitatem soni  
vel vocis; non enim sic fieret vox, ut patet per propositionem Aristotilis iam  
dictam. Vnde bonitas vocis generande non permittit tertium spiritum fieri qui  
componatur ex aspero et leni. Sic autem non est ex parte accentus: acutus enim  
accentus est secundum quod aer eleuatur secundum magis et minus ad superiores

170 partes vocalis arterie; grauis autem fit per emissionem aeris deorsum ad inferiores  
partes vocalis arterie. Set in hiis potest aer contineri, frangi et figurari et inmitti  
deorsum antequam exprimatur, sicut patet ymaginando huiusmodi experimentum.  
Ista autem conferunt ad bonitatem vocis siue soni, et non impediunt, et propterea  
ex hiis duobus accentibus potest fieri tertius ex hiis compositus.

175 67. Ad tertium quesitum [63] dicendum quod accentus principalis est ad hoc  
quod continue proferantur partes dictionis et indistanter, ut simul reperiantur ut  
unum materiale respectu significationis dictionis. Set si esset accentus quartus qui  
inciperet ab alto et tenderet in imum et iterum in altum, non continue profererentur  
partes dictionis et indistanter, et ita non acciperentur ut unum materiale respectu

162-163 Arist., *De an.* 2.8 (421a2-3).

149 et<sup>1</sup>] nec V      150 incomplete] non complete V      habeat] habet C      151 nec<sup>1</sup>] non  
C      152 littera] sonus C      154 aliquod] aliquid V      157 hiis venientibus] hiis uonientibus  
(?) C: conuenientibus V      compositione] -nem V      158 altero extremorum] aliquo V  
160 extremorum] -mo V      161 solutio] alia ratio V      162 inspirantem] in aspiracione (corr.  
ex inspi-) C      expirantem] in expiracione C      164 ex om. V      167 generande] -do V  
169 eleuatur] -uetur V      magis] maius V      173 conferunt] faciunt V      174 accentibus]  
acciden- V      175 quesitum om. C      176 quod] ut V      proferantur] -runtur C      simul  
reperiantur] sic recipi- V      178 proferentur] profierentur C

180 significationis, et propterea talis accentus constare non debet. Explanatio dicti talis  
est. Ad hoc quod continue proferantur partes dictionis, oportet ut ubi terminatur  
accentus non principalis, precedens accentum principalem, incipiat accentus  
principalis, et ubi terminatur principalis incipiat non principalis subsequens. Hoc  
autem non semper contingeret si esset accentus compositus modo dicto: quod sic  
185 ostenditur. Grauis accentus qui dicitur *non principalis* multipliciter potest esse  
dictionis, quia plures graues possunt esse in eadem dictione. Esto igitur quod aliqua  
dictio trisyllaba grauetur in principio et in fine, si ergo hec eadem dictio haberet  
in medio accentum compositum qui inciperet ab alto et tenderet in imum et iterum  
in altum, non inciperet ille accentus principalis ubi terminaretur non principalis  
190 precedens, quia grauis precedens terminatur deorsum, et ipse principalis inciperet  
a summo: et sic non esset continuitas, nec indistantia, in prolatione partium  
orationis penes accentum principalem, et propterea talis accentus compositus non  
permittitur fieri. Et bene dico quod si esset talis accentus, ipse esset principalis,  
quia solum grauis dicitur non principalis, quia multipliciter grauis potest esse in  
195 eadem dictione, et nullus alius accentus similiter.

68. Set iuxta hec [67] incidit dubitatio, quia secundum iam dictam responsio-  
nem videtur quod accentus circumflexus quem nos habemus non erit accentus hac  
ratione: si sillaba subsequens sillabam circumflexam grauetur, cum grauis accentus  
incipiat ab alto et tendat in imum, eius accentus incipit in sursum; set accentus  
200 sillabe precedentis que circumflectitur terminatur deorsum; quare non incipit  
accentus non principalis ubi terminatur accentus principalis, et ita non erit  
continuitas in partibus proferendis, et sic non erit accentus circumflexus accentus,  
ut videtur, quia accentus, scilicet principalis, est ut continue proferantur partes  
dictionis.

205 69. Ad quod [68] dicendum est quod principalis accentus maxime dicitur  
*principalis* propter eleuationem. / Vnde principalis accentus magis habet de C 24rb  
eleuatione in sursum quam inceptio accentus non principalis. Vnde quod est  
deorsum accentus principalis potest esse sursum accentus non principalis, set non  
econuerso. Vnde, cum circumflexus terminetur deorsum, potest grauis subsequens  
210 incipi ibidem, et cum incipitur suo in sursum, et ita erit continuitas; non enim  
incipietur grauis in sursum respectu descisionis circumflexi set ibidem ubi termina-

181 oportet *om. V* ubi terminatur] ibi terminetur *C* 184 contingeret] -git *C* post  
dicto *add. idem C* 186 graues] significationes *C* 187 in<sup>2</sup> *om. V* 188 inciperet] ex- *V*  
189 principalis<sup>1</sup> *om. V* ubi terminaretur] ubi -ret *V*: nisi sequeretur *C* 190 post et *add.*  
quod *C* 191 continuitas nec indistantia] continuitas set indistinctio *C*: incontinuitas nec  
indistantia *V* 195 accentus *om. V* 196 incidit...quia] incidunt dubitationes hac ratione  
scilicet quod *C* iam *om. V* 197 accentus<sup>1</sup> *om. V* erit] sit *C* 199 tendat]  
descendat *V* 201 terminatur accentus] terminetur *C* 202 partibus proferendis] parte  
(*deinde spatium duorum verborum*) *V* 204 dictionis *om. V* 207 accentus *om. V*  
209 terminetur] -natur *V* 210 cum incipitur *om. V* sed *spatio duorum verborum relicto*  
211 descisionis] desicionis *V*

tur circumflexus; et sic non erit discontinuitas in proferendo partes dictionis, set bene accipientur ut unum materiale respectu significationis: et ita erit accentus circumflexus.

215 70. Consequenter queritur de hiis que dicit comparando dictiones adinuicem quas ponit. Primo enim dicit quod accentus diuiditur tripartito, deinde quod in decem: quare vel una superflua est, vel altera diminuta.

71. Ad quod [70] dicendum quod *accentus*, sicut supradictum est [60], sumitur communiter et proprie: proprie, secundum quod diuiditur ex opposito  
220 contra spiritum et non comprehendit spiritum, et prout accentus unius est sillabe tantum, et sic sumitur in prima diuisione; communiter autem sumitur secundum quod comprehendit sub se spiritum, ut patet ex supradictis [60], et sic est plurium sillabarum quam unius, sicut patet in yphen et longam virgulam, etc., et sic sumitur in secunda diuisione. Et sic cessat contrarietas.

225 72. Antequam autem specialiter queratur circa diuisionem secundam, notandum utilitates horum accentuum. De graui et acuto et circumflexo manifesta est utilitas. Longa uirgula est ad denotandum dictionem grauari per omnes sillabas; et iste accentus patet quod est plurium sillabarum, et ita non est accentus proprie; et talis accentus fit in prepositionibus, quando preponitur suis casualibus, et in  
230 relatiuis prepositis suis antecedentibus; et ad denotandum talem accentum protrahenda est talis linea <—> supra illam dictionem que debet grauari per omnes sillabas. Breuis virgula debet poni supra dictionem simplicem ad denotandum unum esse accentum principalem in aliqua sillaba et alias omnes sillabas grauari, ut *meta* tali figura U. Yphen autem notat idem fieri in dictione composita; debet  
235 enim poni supra dictionem compositam, cuiusmodi est hec dictio *respublica*, ad denotandum unam sillabam habere accentum principalem et omnes alias grauari, tali figura ∪. Et dicuntur isti accentus constare ex principali et non principali, quia notaret in eadem sillaba fieri collationem principalis ad non principalem; sunt enim accentus plurium sillabarum, et non unius tantum, et notant unum fieri accentum  
240 principalem et alias non principales. Diastole vero est contraria yphen, quia notat vocem que prius habuit unicum accentum principalem per compositionem iam habere plura, scilicet duos, per hoc quod disgregantur partes componentes et fiunt

215 *De acc.* II.5 (p. 519.27).

216-217 *ibid.* (pp. 519.27-520.3).

212 erit] est C 215 de...dicit om. V 216 tripartito] -tite V 217 vel una] ultima C  
218 supradictum] dictum C 219 proprie<sup>2</sup> om. C 223 post unius add. sit C yphen]  
ysen V 225 autem om. C circa om. V 225-226 post notandum add. quod C  
226 accentum] accidentium V manifesta] variata (corr. in marg.) C 228 patet] secundum  
C 229 prepositionibus corr. ex propo- V 231 post linea figuram suppleui  
231-233 per...grauari om. V 234 fieri] set C 235 supra] super C respublica] res  
publica V 237 figuram haud recte suppleuit V 237-238 quia notaret] non quia notet V  
240 quia] que C 242 plura scilicet om. V

diuerse dictiones; et sic est nota diuersorum principalium accentuum, et propterea dicitur componi ex pluribus principalibus accentibus; et sic fit hec figura ʹ.  
 245 Apostrophos notat subreptionem vocalis a fine dictionis, remanente consonante cum quo habet colliterari; et fit sic ʹ, sicut figura precedens, set hoc interest quod figura apostrophos habet poni super ultimam litteram dictionis, figura vero diastole non, set supra dictiones diuersas et separatas directe habet poni. Dasia autem est ad denotandum aliquam vocalem aspirari, cum ibi apponatur nota aspirationis, ut  
 250 *hamus*, et fit super illam vocalem talis figura ʹ. Silen autem est econtrario ad denotandum vocalem leniter debere proferri quando ei apponitur aspiratio in scripto, ut *hamo*, et fit super ipsam talis figura ʹ.

73. Et sciendum quod *yphen* interpretatur coniunctio. *Diastole* dicitur a *dia*, quod est duo, et *stole*, missio siue diuisio, quasi diuisio dictionis, faciens duos  
 255 principales accentus ubi prius fuit unicus. *Apostrophos* dicitur ab *apos*, quod est *re*, et *strophos*, versio, quasi reuersio figure ad id quod est retro, idest ad ultimam litteram dictionis. *Diasia* interpretatur aspiratio; *silen*, siccitas vel paruum sonans.

74. Queritur numerus et sufficientia istorum accentuum.

75. Ad quod dicendum hoc modo. *Accentus est certa lex ad eleuandum et*  
 260 *deprimendum*, etc. Illa ergo eleuatio et depressio in sono, siue accentus, / vel V 106rb  
 prouenit ex sua / generatione tantum vel ex sono extrinsecus adueniente; si ex sua C 24va  
 generatione tantum, vel ergo in dictione integra vel in dictione apocopata; si in apocopata, dicitur *apostrophos*, ubi sublata est vocalis in fine dictionis. Si autem proueniat in dictione integra, vel ergo est accentus unius sillabe tantum vel plurium,  
 265 hoc est aggregatus ex accentibus plurium sillabarum: si autem sit accentus unius sillabe tantum, aut ergo est eleuans sillabam et dicitur *acutus*, aut deprimens ipsam et dicitur *grauis*, aut utroque modo et dicitur ex hiis compositus, scilicet *circumflexus*. Si autem sit aggregatus ex accentibus plurium sillabarum, vel ergo erit ex pluribus accentibus principalibus et dicitur *diastole*, vel ex pluribus non principali-  
 270 bus et dicitur *longa virgula*, vel ex uno principali et altero non principali. Set hoc diuiditur: vel enim constat ex hiis existentibus in eadem dictione et simplici et dicitur *breuis virgula*, vel in diuersis, conuenientibus tamen in unum sicut in

259-260 *De acc.* II.5 (p. 519.25-26).

243 diuersorum] duorum V 245 subreptionem] recepcionem C dictionis] consonantis C 246 colliterari] colligi C 247 diastole] -les V 248 dasia] dyasia V 249 aliquam vocalem] aliquem vocali V ibi apponatur] ei apponitur V 250 et fit super] supra V post figura add. fit V 252 hamo ex Beda *De orthographia* (GL 7.274:22) citatur: habet homo V: quid C, incertum super] supra V ʹ om. C 253 post coniunctio add. di C 254 stole] stolon CV 255 apostrophos] -phus C est] es V 256 figure] -rarum C retro] recta C 257 silen] simile C paruum] non C 258 accentuum] accidentium V 259 hoc modo] quod C 262, 263 apocopata] apocopa C 263 sublata] ab- C vocalis] vox C 264 plurium] plurimi C 265 aggregatus] con- C 266 aut<sup>2</sup>] vel V 267 aut] vel V 268 aggregatus] con- C vel] aut C 269 pluribus<sup>1</sup> om. C diastole] apostrophe V 272 unum] unicum V

dictione composita, et tunc dicitur *yphen*. Si autem proueniat eleuatio et depressio in sono, non ex sua generatione tantum, set ex sono extrinsecus adueniente, vel  
 275 ergo secundum eam eleuatur sillaba et dicitur *diasian*, vel deprimitur et tunc fit *sylen*. Et sic patet numerus et sufficientia.

76. Set queritur specialiter super hanc diuisionem hoc modo: quidam accentus constat ex duobus principalibus accentibus sicut diastole, et quidam constat ex principali et non principali; queritur igitur quare iste qui constat ex principali et  
 280 non principali diuiditur in duas, sicut in *yphen* et breuem virgulam, non autem ille qui constat ex duobus principalibus.

77. Ad quod [76] dicendum quod duo accentus principales non possunt esse in eadem dictione, set oportet eos esse in diuersis simpliciter; unus autem principalis et alter non principalis possunt esse in una dictione vel in diuersis aliquo  
 285 modo, sicut in composita dictione, et penes hoc multiplicatur accentus constans ex accentu principali et non principali. In una dictione fit talis accentus ubi una est principalis et alie sillabe habent accentum non principalem, et maxime in illis ubi transmutatur accentus causa differentie in dictionibus simplicibus, ut in hac dictione *pone*, *ergo*, etc., et ad hunc representandum est breuis virgula. Fit autem  
 290 in pluribus, sicut quando illi duo accentus ex quibus constat prius fuerunt in dictionibus diuersis, nunc autem sunt in una composita, set fit ex uno principali non principalis, et ad hunc denotandum denotandum est *yphen*; sic autem non multiplicatur accentus ille qui fit ex pluribus principalibus, et ideo non diuiditur ille in plures.

295 78. Consequenter queritur circa apostrophen hoc modo, quare scilicet magis habemus unum modum accentuandi et eius notam denotantem ultimam vocalem dictionis deesse quam ultimam consonantem.

79. Item, sicut per apocopen potest deesse ultima vocalis, similiter per efferesim potest prima deesse, et secunda vel media per sincopam: queritur igitur  
 300 quare magis habemus unum modum accentuandi et eius notam secundum quod deest ultima quam secundum quod deest prima vel media.

80. Ad primum [78] dicendum est quod non constituitur modus accentuandi, etc., penes defectum ultime consonantis sicut penes defectum ultime vocalis hac ratione: per defectum ultime vocalis transfertur accentus a loco proprio in locum  
 305 alium et non proprium et indebitum, et non per defectum consonantis. Et hoc patet

273 et<sup>2</sup>] vel *V*      275 tunc fit] dicitur *C*      277 super] supra *V*      quidam] quod *V*  
 278 principalibus *om. V*      279-280 queritur...principalis *om. C*      282 duo *om. V*  
 283 eadem dictione] eodem *V*      diuersis] -sas *V*      284 alter] aliter *C*      287 in illis] talis  
*C*      288 transmutatur accentus] transsiuntur (?) actus *V*      289 hunc] hoc *C*      290 sicut]  
 scilicet *V*      291 uno *om. C*      293 accentus ille] actus iste *V*      ille<sup>2</sup>] iste *V*      295 magis  
*om. C*      298 apocopen] -pan *C*      298-299 per...potest] primo potest per efferesim *C*  
 299 vel] siue *V*      sincopam] cin- *C*      300 notam *om. V*      303 post consonantis *add. vel*  
*V*      penes<sup>2</sup>] per *V*      304-305 locum alium et *om. V*



sic: si ultima consonans desit, non propter hoc deest sillaba; si ultima vocali deficiente, et deficit ultima sillaba, quia vocalis est tota forma sillabe, et non consonans. Et propterea, si principalis accentus cadit prius supra penultimam sillabam, deficiente ultima, cadit supra ultimam, cum penultima fiat post ultima.

310 Sed apud nos Latinos non fit accentus super ultimam sillabam nisi differentie causa, ut dicit auctor inferius: quare patet quod ibi transmutatur accentus a loco naturali in locum non naturalem et non debitum. Set cum deficiente consonante, non deficiat sillaba, non erit propter eius defectum translatio accentus ad locum inproprium: et propterea penes defectum vocalis constituitur accentus et non penes  
315 defectum consonantis.

81. Ad secundum [79] dicendum est quod, deficiente prima vel media vocali, non transfertur accentus in locum indebitum sicut deficiente ultima: et propterea penes defectum prime vel medie non constituitur modus accentuandi sicut penes defectum ultime. Et quod hoc sit verum sic explanatur. Si accentus principalis cadit  
320 supra mediam sillabam vel vocalem, aut ergo deficit ipsa vel precedens vocalis. Si precedens, adhuc permanet accentus super eandem mediam et non transmutatur in locum non debitum; non enim transmutatur in locum ultimum, et ille solum indebitus est principali accentui. Si autem deficiat ipsa media, transferetur accentus ad vocalem precedentem et non ad ultimam. Et hac ratione debet transferri ad  
325 illam que magis nata est ipsum accipere secundum locum suum. Hec autem est precedens et non ultima, quia primus locus non est / ei indebitus principali C 24vb accentui set ultimus: quare adhuc non transfertur ad locum non debitum set debitum, et ita patet quod propter defectum medie sillabe non fit translatio accentus ad locum indebitum. Si autem cadat principalis accentus super primam  
330 vocalem, aut ergo ipsa auferetur aut media. Si media, remouebitur accentus translatio ad locum indebitum; si ipsa prima, transferetur ad illam vocalem que prius erat media, et ita non transfertur neque ad locum indebitum, quia non neque ad locum ultimum. Et ita propter defectum prime vocalis non causatur translatio accentus ad locum indebitum. Si autem deficiat ultima vocalis, et principalis  
335 accentus cadat supra penultimam, tunc transfertur accentus ad locum ultimum, et

310 *De acc.* II.8 (p. 520.29-30).

308 post accentus add. non C	309 cum...ultima om. V	ultima <sup>2</sup> ] ultimaima C
310 super] supra V	differentie] duplex C	311 transmutatur] transumitur (?) C
313 deficiat] -cit V	314 constituitur] construitur C	317 indebitum] non debitum V
321 permanet] re- V	accentus om. C	mediam] sillabam V
322 deficiat] deficit C	323 deficiat] deficit C	
transferetur] -ferretur C: -fertur V	325 illam] ipsam C	que magis rep. V
326 et non] non est C	locus] accentus C	327 non debitum] debitus C
329 ad] in V	super] supra V	330 ipsa auferetur] auferretur prima C
331 translatio ad] translatus ad C: translatus in V	prima transferetur] prima nec C: transferetur	
neque (post spatium) V	332 non transfertur V	quia] quare V
		334 deficiat] fiat C

ita ad locum indebitum: et propterea penes ablationem vocalis ultime constituitur accentus et non penes ablationem prime vel medie.

82. Consequenter queritur circa iam dicta, scilicet circa diasian et silen [75], hoc modo: spiritus est accidens sillabe, diuisum contra accentum; ergo modus spirandi contra modum accentuandi; quare, cum diasian et silen sint modi spirandi, inconuenienter ponuntur esse modi accentuandi.

83. Item, cum hoc [82] queritur quare non ponit duos modos accentuandi penes tempus, diuisum in productum et correptum, sicut penes spiritum, diuisum in asperum et lenem, cum utrumque sit accidens sillabe.

84. Ad primum [82] patet responsio per superius dicta et determinata [60], quod sumendo *accentum* communiter comprehendit sub se spiritum, et sic non diuiditur contra spiritum; proprie vero sumendo *accentum* non comprehendit ipsum, immo diuiditur contra ipsum. Set in hac diuisione quando diuiditur per decem species, sumitur communiter sicut patet ex predeterminatis [71]; set secundum quod sumitur proprie, diuiditur prima diuisione, scilicet trimembri.

85. Ad ultimum [83] dicendum est quod tempus non addit sonum set solum extensionem more circa sillabam vel litteram; aspiratio autem addit sonum, licet incompletum. Mediante autem sono fit eleuatio et depressio; set accentus consistit in eleuando et deprimendo: quare accentus consistit mediante sono et non mediante extensione in mora sillabe. Et propterea non constituitur accentus penes tempus sicut penes spiritum, licet sit accidens sillabe sicut et spiritus.

### <LECTIO 3>

86. NOTANDUM ETIAM QUOD ACCENTUS, etc. (II.7; 520.17) Postquam manifestauit quod sit accentus, hic manifestat in qua parte dictionis fieri habet / accentus. Et diuiditur hec pars in duas: in quarum prima manifestat in qua parte dictionis habet fieri accentus; in secunda determinat causas inpedientes ne fiat accentus semper in tali parte cum dicit, TRES QUIDEM RES, etc. (II.8; 520.25-26)

87. Prima pars harum diuiditur in duas: in quarum prima manifestat in qua parte dictionis habet fieri accentus in dictionibus non barbaris; in secunda, in qua parte habet fieri in dictionibus barbaris cum dicit, SET IN PEREGRINIS ET BARBARIS, etc. (II.8; 520.23-24)

338 iam...circa om. V 340 sint] sicut C 342 cum hoc om. C 344 in corr. ex et C:  
per V 345 dicta et om. V 347 accentum om. V 349 species] spiritus V set om.  
V 351 ultimum] alterum V 352 circa] contra V licet] littere C  
Lectio 3 3 accentus<sup>2</sup> om. V 5-6 fiat...semper] semper fiat C 6 quidem] siquidem  
V 7 in<sup>3</sup>] im (?) C 9 parte om. C set] si V 9-10 et...etc. om. C

88. Item, prima istarum diuiditur in duas: in quarum prima manifestat in qua parte habet fieri accentus in dictionibus non barbaris; in secunda manifestat qui accentus possunt esse in eadem dictione cum dicit, *PONITUR NAMQUE GRAUIS*, etc. (II.8; 520.19-20)

15 89. Consequenter determinat causas inpedientes rectum locum accentus, et illa pars habet duas: quia primo manifestat quot sunt cause inpedientes; secundo explanat has causas cum dicit, *SET QUALITER HOC FIAT*, etc. (II.8; 520.27)

90. Et hec ultima pars diuiditur in tres iuxta tres causas que inpediunt naturalem locum accentus: secunda incipit ibi, *AMBIGUITAS VERO*, etc. (II.9; 20 520.32-33); tertia ibi, *NECESSITAS PRONUNTIATIONIS REGULAS*, etc. (II.9; 520.36)

91. Et hec tertia pars diuiditur in duas: in quarum prima manifestat qualiter necessitas pronuntiationis inpediat locum accentus; in secunda manifestat per que, ubi dicit, *SUNT AUTEM SILLABE TRES*, etc. (II.10; 521.1)

92. In speciali sic procedit, dicens quod accentus principalis, scilicet acutus et 25 circumflexus, apud Latinos principaliter fieri habet supra sillabam penultimam vel antepenultimam; apud Grecos autem optinet tres locos, scilicet locum supra sillabam ultimam, penultimam et antepenultimam. Et hoc est quod dicit, *NOTANDUM ETIAM*, etc. (II.7; 520.17)

93. Consequenter ostendit qui possunt esse in eadem dictione, dicens quod 30 grauis et acutus vel grauis et circumflexus possunt esse in eadem dictione, set non circumflexus et acutus, quia una sola sillaba, tam in dictionibus simplicibus quam in compositis, acuetur, et omnes alie grauabuntur. Et sciendum quod acutus et circumflexus non possunt esse in eadem dictione, quia isti sunt accentus principales, et duo accentus principales non possunt esse in eadem dictione. Et hoc est 35 quod dicit, *PONITUR NAMQUE GRAUIS*, etc. (II.8; 520.19-20)

94. Consequenter ostendit qualiter sit accentus in dictionibus barbaris et peregrinis, dicens quod in barbaris et peregrinis nominibus neque etiam in interiectionibus est certus locus accentus neque certus accentus, et propterea / poterit C 25ra quislibet proferens ordinare ipsa in metro sub accentu quem viderit expediens. Et 40 hoc est quod dicit, *SET IN PEREGRINIS*, etc. (II.8; 520.23)

95. Consequenter determinat causas inpedientes dictos locos accentuum, dicens quod sunt tres, scilicet distinguendi ratio et pronuntiandi ambiguitas atque

11 istarum] harum V    13 grauis etc. om. C    15 locum accentus] accentum C    16 quia primo] in prima C    17 explanat] -natur C    19 ambiguitas...etc.] antiquitas C    20 regulas etc. om. C    22 inpediat] -dit V    22-23 que...dicit] quam ibi C    23 sillabe...etc.] sillabe C: sume (?) tres etc. V    24 acutus et] accentus C    25 vel] et C    26 post locos add. siue tria loca C    locum om. C    27 hoc om. V    quod dicit om. C    28 etiam etc. om. C    29 ostendit] dicit C    31 una sola] aliqua una C    32 in om. C    34 et<sup>1</sup>...principales in marg. C    35 quod dicit om. C    36 qualiter sit] quare fiat V    37 in<sup>2</sup> om. C    37-38 neque...accentus om. C    39 quem] quando C    40 quod dicit om. C    set om. V    41 inpedientes] inpediendi V    42 atque] et C

necessitas. Et ostendit statim quando incidit ratio distinguendi, dicens quod quando aliqua dictio continetur sub diuersis partibus orationis, ad distinguendum  
 45 que pars sit orationis cum profertur transmutatur aliquando accentus a loco proprio ad in proprium sicuti ad ultimum, ut in hac dictione *pone* manifestum est quod secundum quod verbum est grauatur in ultima sillaba, secundum quod prepositio acuitur in ultima sillaba. Similiter hec dictio *ergo* secundum quod est coniunctio grauatur in ultima sillaba, secundum quod est nomen acuitur, ut distinguatur  
 50 secundum quod est coniunctio a se secundum quod est nomen. Et hoc est quod dicit, TRES SIQUIDEM RES, etc. (II.8; 520.25-26), usque ibi, AMBIGUITAS, etc. (II.9; 520.32) Et sciendum quod sumitur *ergo* nomen ut in Lucano, *illius ergo*, idest illius causa.

96. Consequenter ostendit quod ambiguitas pronuntiandi inpedit quandoque  
 55 naturalem locum accentus, sicut quando dubium est an vox debeat esse una dictio an plures in pronuntiatione: ut si dicatur *interea loci*, si sit una dictio, cadit accentus supra ultimam huius quod dico *interea*; si due, non, inmo tunc sunt ibi duo accentus principales. Vnde ad remouendam istam ambiguitatem pronuntiandi vocem quando est dictio et quando omnino cadit principalis accentus supra  
 60 ultimam huius quod dico *interea*, et sit tantum unus principalis accentus in hac voce *interealoci* secundum quod est dictio. Et sic cadit in loco non proprio secundum Latinos, quia cadit in ultima sillaba huius dictionis *interea*. Et hoc est quod dicit, AMBIGUITAS, etc. (II.9; 520.32-33)

97. Consequenter ostendit quod necessitas pronuntiationis facit idem, ut  
 65 quando dictio enclitica ordinatur cum alia dictione retorquet accentum principalem precedentis dictionis qui fuit in sillaba precedente ultimam, et sic quod retorquet accentum dictionis precedentis ad subsequentem. Et propter hoc dicuntur *enclitice*, idest inclinatie, quia inclinant ad se accentum precedentis dictionis, ut si quis prius dicat *doctus*, accentus fit supra primam sillabam; si vero dicat  
 70 *doctusque* addendo coniunctionem, necessitate pronuntiationis fit accentus in ultima sillaba, et ita in loco eorum non debito. Et hoc est quod dicit, NECESSITAS PRONUNTATIONIS, etc. (II.9; 520.36)

52 *rectius Verg., Aen. 6.670.*

---

45 aliquando *om. C* 47 in *om. C* post sillaba *add. et canc. per 'vacat'* similiter hec dictio  
 ergo secundum quod est con *C* 48 est coniunctio] nomen *V* 49 sillaba *om. V*  
 51 siquidem] quidem *C* 52 sciendum] notandum *V* 56 an] vel *V* loci] late (?) *C*  
 si<sup>2</sup> in *marg. C* 57 supra] super *C* 58 unde] videtur *C* istam *om. V* 61 interealoci]  
 interea loci *V* post interea *expunx. va C* et sic] si *C* 64 ut] vel *C* 66-67 preceden-  
 tis...ad] dictionis precedentis et *V* 67-68 propter...dicuntur] propterea dicitur *V* 68 incli-  
 nant] -nat *V* 69 prius] primo *V* 70 addendo] autem additus (*corr. ex addicio?*) *C*  
 71 eorum *om. V* quod dicit *om. C*

98. Consequenter ostendit per que sic retorquetur accentus ad ultimam  
 sillabam dictionis, dicens quod sunt sillabe tres, scilicet *que, ne, ve*, ut *dixitque*,  
 75 *venitne, currit disputatue*. Et similiter intelligendum est in consimilem vim habenti-  
 bus, ut in hiis dictionibus *nobiscum, vobiscum*, nisi quis dicat quod non sit ibi  
 accentus in ultima sillaba dictionis quia est dictio composita *nobiscum, vobiscum*  
 similiter. Set sciendum quia fit *cum* in fine huius dictionis *nobis* et *vobis*, et in hoc  
 habet hec dictio *cum* vim encliticarum dictionum. Et hoc est quod dicit, SUNT  
 80 QUIDEM SILLABE TRES, etc. (II.10; 521.1)

99. Circa primam partem huius lectionis primo queritur hoc modo: cum tanta  
 videatur esse mora secundum depressionem in graui accentu quanta et in acuto  
 secundum eleuationem, quare magis ponitur acutus esse accentus principalis quam  
 grauis, queritur igitur quare ponuntur alii accentus a graui esse principales et grauis  
 85 non.

100. Ad hoc [99] dicendum quod accentus principalis fit propter sonoritatem.  
 Sonoritas autem magis habetur per eleuationem quam depressionem, et propterea  
 accentus qui consistunt in eleuatione magis constituuntur principales quam ille qui  
 consistit in depressione. Set acutus et circumflexus magis consistunt in eleuatione,  
 90 et grauis magis in depressione, et propterea ponuntur accentus acutus et circum-  
 flexus esse principales, et grauis non.

101. Quod autem sonoritas magis habeatur per eleuationem quam per de-  
 pressionem ostendo: mora enim causat sonoritatem; set maior est mora in  
 eleuatione quam in depressione; ergo et maior sonoritas. Et quod maior sit mora  
 95 in eleuatione quam in depressione sic ostendo: eleuatio enim non fit nisi per  
 motum instrumentorum sursum, depressio vero per motum eorundem deorsum;  
 set ipsa instrumenta, cum sint grauia, naturaliter mouentur deorsum, non autem  
 sursum nisi per violentiam; et ideo facilius mouentur ad depressionem quam ad  
 eleuationem; et ideo minor fit mora in depressione quam in eleuatione; quare, cum  
 100 in accentu graui fiat depressio, in aliis autem eleuatio, minor fit mora in ipso quam  
 in aliis, et ita minor sonoritas.

102. Item, ad idem [99] ostenditur adhuc hoc modo: instrumenta magis  
 aperiuntur in eleuatione et magis clauduntur in depressione quam econuerso;  
 sonoritas autem et vox magis generantur in apertione quam in clausione; et ideo,

73 *que]* quem *V*    sic] scilicet *C*    74 *quod]* quot *C*    , 75 *currit disputatue]* currit disputat  
 ne *C*; disputat ue *V*    76-77 nisi...vobiscum *om. C*    78 quia fit cum] quod fit tantum *V*  
 nobis] nobiscum *V*    vobis] vobiscum *V*    79 encliticarum] -cam *C*    79-80 sunt quidem] sic  
 autem *C*    81 hoc modo] hic *C*    82 videatur] -batur *V*    84 queritur *om. C*  
 87 habetur] habet *C*    quam *om. C*    89 consistit] -tunt *V*    90 accentus *om. C*    92 per<sup>2</sup>  
*om. C*    94-95 ergo...depressione] quod *C*    95 enim *om. V*    97 cum...grauia *om. V* sed  
*spatio quatuor verborum relicto*    98 et ideo *om. V* sed *spatio duorum verborum relicto*    ad<sup>2</sup>  
*om. C*    100 ipso] ipsis *V*    102 ad *om. V*    adhuc *om. V*    104 generantur] -ratur *C*

105 cum principalis accentus sit propter sonoritatem, et acutus et circumflexus magis faciunt sonoritatem quam grauis quia magis consistunt in apertione que est causa sonoritatis, ideo constituuntur acutus et circumflexus esse accentus principales, et grauis non.

103. Si autem obiciat aliquis quod circumflexus consistit tam in depressione  
110 quam in eleuatione, et ita qua ratione erit accentus principalis erit et non principalis, iam patet ad illud responsio: maior enim mora fit in eleuatione quam  
V 106vb in depressione, / et ideo maior sonorus; et ita magis consistit et principalius in  
C 25rb eleuatione quam in depressione; et propterea dicitur principalis magis quam non. /

104. Consequenter queritur quare tantum unicus accentus principalis debet  
115 esse unius dictionis.

105. Ad quod [104] dicendum quod accentus principalis est ad continuandum partes dictionis sic ut fiat tanquam unum materiale respectu significationis representande; hunc autem maxime per aliquid unum continuans: quare necesse est esse in dictione unicum accentum principalem continuantem eius partes, etc.,  
120 ad quem relique sillabe dictionis inclinatur quemadmodum omnes partes corporis ad unam perfectionem principalem inclinantur et quantum sunt sicut partes unius.

106. Set queritur ulterius: si ita sit quod tantum unicus accentus fieri habeat in dictione una apud nos, quare apud nos non possunt fieri supra ultimam sillabam sicut apud Grecos cum nos sumus Grecorum imitatores.

125 107. Ad hoc [106] dicendum quod ultima sillaba conuenientior est depressioni quam eleuationi quia in fine dictionis clauduntur labia proprie et quasi quiescunt; set ad hoc quod claudantur instrumenta oportet quod sit motus deorsum et ita depressio; set accentus principalis non fit per depressionem set per eleuationem: et ita apud nos supra ultimam sillabam non fit accentus principalis. Et hec  
130 est consideratio Latinorum quare in ultimam sillabam proprie non accedit principalis accentus.

108. Ad hoc autem quod dicit quod nos sumus Grecorum imitatores [106] dicendum quod non imitamur eos nisi in benedictis et per rationem magnam. Et hoc est per hoc manifestum quod ipsi diuidunt litteras penes sua accidentia, sicut  
135 o per othomega, quod est o longum, et otomicron, quod est o breue, et similiter e: unde constituunt unam litteram esse duas propter eius duo accidentia. Nos autem sic non facimus; non enim diuersificamus nisi per differentias essentielles. Sic

106 consistunt] -tit C	107 constituuntur om. V sed spatio unius verbi relicto	principales]
-lis V	110 in om. C	erit <sup>1</sup> corr. ex eria V
112-113 maior...propterea]	prima C	113 magis quam]
add. non C	117 fiat tanquam]	accipiat V
120-121 ad...unius om. V	122 tantum]	cum C
habet V	123 quare...nos om. V	possunt] -sit V
130 quare]	quia V	accidit] cadit V
136 nos om. V		

igitur patet quod non sequimur eos in omnibus set tantum in benedictis et ubi fortes  
et efficaces habent pro se rationes. Ratio autem quare ipsi Greci in ultima sillaba  
140 poterant ponere principalem accentum hec potest esse: quod significatio dictionis  
maxime discernitur per finem; et ideo ad discernendam significationem dictionis  
poterant accentuare in ultima sillaba, que est finis dictionis. Et hec forte fuit eorum  
consideratio.

109. Set adhuc dubitatur: nondum enim videtur sufficienter dici causa quare  
145 principalis accentus non fiat in ultima sillaba, propter hoc quod fit in eleuatione,  
et fini dictionis conuenit magis depressio. De acuto enim accentu sufficit hec causa,  
set cum circumflexus accentus similiter terminetur in depressione sicut et finis  
dictionis, videtur quod in fine dictionis, scilicet in ultima sillaba, possit fieri  
circumflexus.

150 110. Ad hoc [109] dicendum quod, sicut dictum est [101, 103], licet  
terminetur circumflexus in depressione, plus tamen habet de eleuatione quam de  
depressione, quia in eleuatione fit maior mora ratione violentie in motu instrumen-  
torum, quia in eleuatione mouetur sursum; set hoc non contingit nisi per violenti-  
am cum ipsa sint grauia naturaliter: et propterea non ponitur accentus circum-  
155 flexus in ultima sillaba sicut neque acutus.

111. Ex iam dictis [106-110] oritur dubitatio talis: videtur quod in nulla  
dictione monosyllaba debeat esse acutus accentus vel circumflexus; et hoc est  
manifeste contra auctorem in principio sequentis lectionis. Si enim principalis  
accentus nunquam cadat in sillaba finiente dictionem, et omnis dictio monosyllaba  
160 est sillaba finiens dictionem, videtur quod in nulla dictione monosyllaba sit accentus  
principalis.

112. Ad hoc [111] dicendum quod dictio monosyllaba siue vox dictionis  
monosyllabe potest considerari dupliciter, scilicet in se vel in comparatione ad  
significationem. Si autem consideretur in se, conuenientior est naturaliter graui  
165 accentui et depressioni quam principali accentui siue eleuationi. Si autem consi-  
deretur vox ipsa dictionis monosyllabe non in se set in comparatione ad signifi-  
cationem, scilicet secundum quod debet denotari secundum quod est dictio et non  
proprie sillaba, vel ad distinguendam seipsam secundum quod est dictio a seipsa

158 cf. *De acc.* II.10 (p. 521.5-6) et infra, § 138.

138 tantum *om.* C ubi] nisi V 139 et efficaces *om.* V 140 poterant] potuerunt V  
hec] hoc CV 142 poterant] potuerunt V forte *om.* C 144 nondum] non V  
146 fini] fine C post accentu *add.* et graui C 147 terminetur] causetur C 148 videtur  
*om.* C 150-151 licet terminetur] quia licet causetur C 154 sint] sunt V naturaliter *om.*  
V propterea] ideo V 155 neque] nec V 156 videtur quod] quod scilicet V 157 et  
hoc] quod V 158 contra auctorem *om.* V sed spatio duorum verborum relicto 159 cadat]  
cadit C 160 dictione *om.* C 164 consideretur] -ret C 165 siue] et V  
165-166 consideretur] -ratur V 167 secundum<sup>2</sup> *om.* V 168 sillaba] -be C vel] et V  
seipsa] se V

secundum quod est sillaba, regi habet accentu principali, scilicet acuto vel circumflexo. Et sic docet auctor inferius considerare accentus monosyllabarum dictionum; primo vero modo considerando monosyllabas processit obiectio.

113. Consequenter queritur quare principales accentus apud nos habent solos hos locos, scilicet penultimam et antepenultimam, et non plures.

114. Item, cum uterque fiat in loco penultimo, queritur quare non similiter in antepenultimo. Et hoc est querere quare circumflexus accentus non fit in antepenultimo loco sicut acutus, inmo solum fit in loco penultimo, et acutus in utroque loco.

115. Ad primum [113] dicendum quod accentus principalis fit in dictione aliquo modo propter discernendum significationem dictionis: unde inest dictioni per relationem ad suam significationem, sicut patet in prima causa inpediente locum accentus. Dicit enim ibi quod, quia nescimus utrum dictio significet sic vel illo modo cum contineatur sub partibus diuersis, ad hoc distinguendum datur ei accentus talis vel talis et in loco non debito. Sic igitur patet quod accentus est in dictione in comparatione ad suam significationem. Set significatio principalis dictionis attenditur penes finem, et propterea iuxta finem, secundum quod vicinus ponitur, debet fieri accentus principalis; quia in fine fieri non potest, sicut superius ostensum est, quare oportet quod sit in loco penitus proximo fini sicut in penultimo, vel in proximo tantum uno mediante sicut in antepenultimo. / Et ita non potest principalis accentus habere loca plura nec alia ab istis.

116. Vel alia causa ad idem [113]: quod si caderet accentus principalis alibi sicut in loco precedente antepenultimum locum, fieret nimia depressio et ita nimia insonoritas, ut patet in hac dictione *predixerat*. Si enim fiat accentus principalis supra primam sillabam, nimia esset depressio per tres subsequentes versus finem dictionis et ita nimia insonoritas, sicut patet experimento vel sensibiliter si proferatur dictio illa tali modo. Sic igitur patet quod necessarium fuit principales accentus non plures nec alios situs habere.

117. Ex hoc iam patet quare uterque principalis accentus cadat in penultima sillaba et non in antepenultima [114], quia ex dictis [116] patet quod ad eufoniam faciendam post eleuationem principalis accentus non debet fieri nisi una depressio vel due ad plus si principalis accentus in eo quod talis solum consistit in eleuatione.

170-171 ibid.

181-183 cf. *De acc.* II.8 (p. 520.27-32).

186-187 vide supra, § 107.

---

170 sic] similiter C    172 principales] -lis C    172-173 habent...locos] habet sola hec C  
 173 plures] plura C    174 item] ideo C    178 fit om. V    180 per relationem] in  
 relatione V    181 quia nescimus] nescimus (*corr. ex nesciens*) C    182 contineatur] constitue-  
 retur C    partibus] pedibus C    183-184 est in dictione] inest dictioni V    185-186 vicinus  
 ponitur] dictum est C    187 fini om. V    188 vel] uno V    190 caderet] cadat C  
 191 locum om. C    193 per] propter C    195 necessarium] necesse V    princi-  
 pales] -lis C    196 nec] esse vel C    197 uterque] utri- C    accentus om. V    cadat]  
 cadit C    198 non om. C    200 si] set C



Quare, cum principalis accentus qui est circumflexus habeat in fine sui depressionem et post eleuationem, non debet sequi nisi duplex depressio ad plus causa predicta: propterea solum in penultima fieri habet circumflexus. Si vero fiat in antepenultima, cum ipse circumflexus habeat post eleuationem in qua consistit  
 205 accentus principalis depressionem unam, et iterum sequuntur due sillabe grauate, et ita duplex depressio, et sic post principalem accentum sunt tres depressiones. Manifestum est quod nimia fieret sic depressio et insonoritas, et ita oportet quod sit in penultima sillaba. Acutus autem accentus non habet nisi eleuationem solum: unde si ponatur in penultima sillaba, sequitur ipsum una depressio; si in antepenultima, duplex; et tantum bene permittat sonoritas et eufonia, set non sinit triplicem vel quadruplicem depressionem, etc., subsequi eleuationem accentus principalis. Vnde tantum in penultima et antepenultima potest fieri accentus, et sic patet secundo quesitum [114].

118. Si consideratur hec vox *interealoci* secundum quod dictio est una et  
 215 composita, non est hec littera *a* debitus locus principalis accentus, quia non est locus ultimus. Si autem consideratur hec vox *interea* ut una dictio per se, et fiat supra hanc litteram *a* accentus principalis, sic ordinatur inproprie, quia continet locum ultimum.

119. Consequenter queritur de causis inpedientibus propria loca accentuum  
 220 quas ponit hoc modo, et primo de prima causa, que dicit quod ratio / distinguendi V 107ra est causa inpediendi, etc. Videtur enim quod hoc sit falsum hoc modo: omnis accentus debetur dictioni ut distinguatur eius significatio a significatione alterius; quare patet quod accentus est propter rationem distinguendi; quare ratio distinguendi non inpediet accentuum regulas set potius rectificabit.

225 120. Ad quod [119] dicendum quod ratio distinguendi duplex est: scilicet significatum unius vocis a significato alterius, et gratia huius est omnis accentus, nec hec distinctio est causa conturbationis regularum accentuum; vel potest ratio distinguendi esse ad distinguendum significatum unius vocis a significatione alia eiusdem vocis, et hec est inpediens locum accentus ad hoc quod vox distinguatur  
 230 penes suas diuersas significationes. Vox enim eadem et equiuoca et sub accentu eodem de se non distinguit sua significata, et propterea ratio distinguendi hec

220-221 cf. *De acc.* II.8 (p. 520.26-32).

203 penultima] ultima C    vero] enim V    204 qua] quo C    205 iterum] etiam C  
 206 sic] ita C    207 fieret] fiat V    208 post sillaba add. solum V    210 tantum] tercium C  
 209-210 antepenultima] -mam sillabam C    211 etc.] et debet C    212 acutus ante  
 accentus add. V    214-218 si...ultimum om. C    215 post locus *canc.* et compositus V  
 219 inpedientibus] inpediendi V    accentuum] accidentium V    220 que] quia V  
 223 quare<sup>1</sup>...est] et C    223-224 quare<sup>2</sup>...distinguendi in marg. C    224 inpediet] -dit C  
 226 significatum] -tam C    vocis a significato] dictionis consignificato C    227 distinctio]  
 diffinicio C    regularum accentuum] regularium accidentium V    230 diuersas om. C

significata in ipsa voce cum necessario permutat accentum, facit conturbationem regularum accentuum. Et hoc ultimo modo sumitur *ratio distinguendi* hic ab auctore; et primo modo processit obiectio.

235 121. Consequenter queritur ex quo accentus est in voce sicut in subiecto et non in significatione; accidens autem dictionis habet diuersificari penes subiectum in quo est et secundum variationem eiusdem; et significatio non est; non variabitur accentus penes variationem significationis set vocis: et ita diuersitas significationis non facit diuersitatem accentus.

240 122. Ad hoc [121] dicendum quod res siue accidens potest variari dupliciter, scilicet per subiectum in quo est et per finem ad quem est. Set ista variatio fiet tamquam per diuersum genus cause. Et quod res diuersificatur penes finem ad quem est, patet per hoc quod necessitas eorum que sunt ad finem dependet ab exigentia finis. Set ita est quod accentus comparatur ad vocem tamquam ad subiectum, ad  
245 significationem autem tamquam ad finem ad quem est. Vnde secundum utrumque illorum habet variari, et non solum penes vocem sicut obiectum est.

123. Consequenter queritur de differentia inter primum modum inpediendi et secundum. Videtur enim quod non differant hac ratione: accentus qui diuersificatur propter ambiguitatem pronuntiandi variatur propter rationem distinguendi, scilicet  
250 ut distinguatur dictio ab oratione ut patet in distinctione huius vocis *interealoci*; quare una istarum causarum continet alteram, et sic non facient diuersas causas inpediendi set unicam tantum.

124. Item, videtur quod tam prima quam secunda contineatur sub tertia, que est necessitas; ratio enim distinguendi est quedam necessitas, et similiter vitium  
255 ambiguitatis in pronuntiando est quedam necessitas: quare videtur quod tam prima quam secunda non differant a tertia.

125. Ad primum [123] dicendum quod in hoc differt primus modus a secundo: quod primus est ad distinguendum dictionem secundum quod est unius partis orationis a se secundum quod est alterius partis orationis; secundus autem  
C 25vb 260 est ad distinguendum dictionem ab oratione. Et concedendum / quod communiter sumendo *rationem distinguendi* continet tam primum modum quam secundum. Set sic non sumitur ab auctore; inmo sumitur proprie per distinctionem eiusdem dictionis a se sub diuersis significatis: et sic separatur secunda causa inpediendi a prima.

232 ipsa voce] ipsam vocem V    necessario] nota C    236 accidens] accentus V    dictionis  
om. V    237 significatio] -tum C    238 penes] per V    241 scilicet] vel V    et] vel V  
set] si V    fiet] fiat V    244 accentus] accidens C    245 significationem] -catum C  
246 illorum] istorum V    247 queritur] sequitur V    247-248 et secundum om. V  
249 propter] penes C    251 facient] faciant V    252 inpediendi om. C    253 conti-  
neatur] -nantur C    254 vitium] necessario V    259 orationis<sup>2</sup> om. C    260 post dictio-  
nem *canc.* secundum quod est unius partis orationis V    262 inmo] set V

265 126. Ad alterum [124] dicendum quod *necessitas* que ponitur tertia causa  
inpediendi sumitur proprie pro necessitate transmutandi accentum, que fit per  
ordinationem dictionis cum dictione per appositionem, vel sic fit per ordinationem  
dictionis enclitice cum alia per compositionem siue per appositionem: per  
compositionem, ut si dicam, *quandoque, itaque*; per appositionem, ut *dixitque,*  
270 *eaque*. Sic autem non fit necessitas in primo modo impediendi neque in secundo.  
In primo enim modo non fit necessitas distinguendi per ordinationem dictionis  
cum dictione sicut fit in tertio. Item in secundo modo fit necessitas distinguendi  
penes ordinationem dictionis cum dictione que fit per compositionem, et hoc non  
dictionis enclitice cum alia, set sic fit in tertio. Sic igitur manifestum est quod  
275 sumendo *necessitatem* communiter, omnes comprehenduntur sub necessitate sicut  
probauit obiectio; sumendo autem proprie, patet differentia inter has causas.

127. Numerus autem et sufficientia istorum modorum impediendi situs ac-  
centuum sic sumatur: si fiat conturbatio accentus, aut ergo cum causa distinctionis  
aut sine; si sine, sic dicitur necessitas et est tertius modus; si cum causa distinc-  
280 tionis, aut ergo causa distinguendi dictionem a dictione, et sic est primus modus;  
vel dictionem ab oratione, et sic secundus modus; vel orationis ab oratione, set  
penes hanc distinctionem non constituitur causa impediens regulas accentuum, quia  
orationi proprie non debetur accentus. Alio modo: si fiat conturbatio accentuum,  
aut ergo per additionem dictionis aut sine; si sine, sic est primus modus si cum  
285 additione dictionis, vel ergo ex additione ad dictionem sub compositione vel extra  
compositionem; si sub compositione, secundus modus; si extra, sic est tertius  
modus.

128. Consequenter queritur de hiis que dicit in explanatione tertii istorum  
modorum; dicit enim quod iste dictiones *que, ne* et *ve* inclinant accentum sillabe  
290 precedentis ad finem dictionis. Set tunc queritur cum hec coniunctio *et* significet  
copulationem sicut hec coniunctio *que*, quare hoc ipsum *et* adiunctum dictioni non  
similiter transmutet accentum sicut hoc ipsum *que*.

129. Item, hec coniunctio *vel* significat disiunctionem sicut hec coniunctio *ve*:  
queritur tunc quare non similiter possit transmutare accentum sicut hec coniunctio  
295 *ve*.

288-290 *De acc.* II.10 (p. 521.1-2).

265 tertia] altera V 266 transmutandi...que] transmutando qui V 267-268 cum...dictio-  
nis om. V 268 post siue add. scilicet C 268-269 per<sup>3</sup> compositionem om. V 270 eaque  
om. V sic] si V fit] sit V neque] nec V 271 ordinationem] ordinem V 274 sic  
igitur s.s. C manifestum est quod] manifestum est igitur sic quod C: om. V 279 dicitur]  
est C modus om. V si cum] sicut C 280 causa om. V a dictione] ad communem  
V 282 distinctionem om. C 283 accentuum] -tus C 284 aut...aut] vel...vel V post  
sine<sup>2</sup> add. siue V 285 vel...additione in marg. C 286 sic est in marg. C 287 modus  
om. V 288 queritur] dubitatur V 290 queritur cum] videtur quod V 292 transmutet]  
-tat V 293 disiunctionem] distinctionem V 294 hec coniunctio] et V

130. Item, sicut hec coniunctio *ne* significat dubitationem, ita et hec coniunctio *an*: queritur igitur quare penes *an* non fiat tertius modus inpediendi accentum sicut penes *ne*.

131. Ad hoc [128-130] est responsio communis ante eius explanationem, que talis est quod hec coniunctio *et* alio modo significat copulationem quam *que*, et *vel* alio modo quam *vel* significat disiunctionem, et *an* alio modo dubitationem quam *ne*: et propter illum diuersum modum quem habent ab aliis possunt transmutare accentum, licet alia non possunt, et possunt inducere alium accentum quam alia possunt.

132. Ad huius explanationem intelligendum est quod copulatio potest denotari dupliciter, scilicet prout est utriusque extremorum indifferenter vel prout est alterius extremorum mediante altero. Item, copulatio utriusque extremorum indifferenter potest denotari dupliciter, scilicet ita quod distinguatur copulatio unius a copulatione alterius quia correlatiue sunt ibi diuerse copulationes, scilicet unus ad alterum et econuerso, vel non ut distinguatur copulatio unius extremi a copulatione alterius. Copulatio autem que fit inter extrema indifferenter ita quod distinguatur copulatio unius a copulatione alterius et notatur per *et* bis positum, ut si dicam *et Sortes et Plato currunt*, quia hoc ipsum *et* primo positum notat copulationem siue correlationem copulationis que est Sortis ad Platonem; idem autem secundo positum notat copulationem econuerso, scilicet Platonis ad Sortem. Copulatio autem ita quod non distinguatur copulatio unius extremi a copulatione alterius notatur per *et* semel positum et in medio positum, ut *Sortes et Plato currunt*. Hic enim per hoc ipsum *et* indifferenter et indistincte notatur correlatiua copulatio que est Sortis ad Platonem et econuerso similiter. Si vero fiat copulatio ita quod denotetur copulatio unius esse mediante altero, ut si mediante posteriori denotetur inesse copulatio priori, sic denotatur per *que*, ut *Sortes Platoque currunt*. Sic igitur patet quod differenter denotatur copulatio per *et* et per *que*, quia hoc ipsum *et* eque primo respicit sua copulata; hoc autem ipsum *que* primo respicit posterius extremorum et consequenter primum illorum. Et propterea ipsa coniunctio *que* ultimo ordinata post extrema respicit utrumque precedens; et econuerso

299-304 cf. Nicolaum Parisiensem, *Scriptum super Ps.-Prisciani De accentibus* (ms. Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 14460, f. 190[‘199’]va-b).

296 hec coniunctio]	hoc ipsum V	296-297 coniunctio]	dictio V	297 fiat]	fit V
298 ne]	ue V	299 que om. V	301 significat om. V	301-302 quam ne]	etc. V
303 alia <sup>1</sup> ]	alio C	possunt <sup>1</sup> ]	-sit C	accentum <sup>2</sup> ]	effectum V
308 distinguatur]	-gitur C	309 ibi]	cui C	312 notatur]	nominatur V
313 currunt]	-rit V	315 scilicet om. V			
316 post ita add. est V	318 indistincte]	non distincte V	notatur om. C	321 sic]	set cum C
322 denotatur]	no- V	323 sua om. V	autem]	secundum C	324-325 prop- terea ipsa coniunctio]
propter hoc debet esse C					

tota dictio a primo extremorum usque ad copulam, respiciendo ipsam, deprimitur et inclinatur usque ad finalem sillabam / dictionis. Vnde supra finem dictionis fit C 26ra  
 accentus, post depressionem factam usque ad copulationem attingendam. Et sic patet qualiter hec coniunctio *que* inclinatur ad finem dictionis accentum sillabe  
 330 precedentis et ratio quare sic autem non fit per hanc coniunctionem / *et*. Vnde, V 107rb  
 cum deficiente causa deficiat effectus, per *et* non fiet huiusmodi inclinatio nec impedimentum accentus.

133. Similiter intelligendum quod disiunctio notatur dupliciter, scilicet ita quod fiat notificatio disiunctionis indifferenter utriusque vel unius extremorum  
 335 mediante altero. Item, disiunctio utriusque extremorum fit dupliciter, ita quod distinguatur disiunctio unius a disiunctione alterius, quia plures sunt correlate considerando rationem multorum extremorum, vel ut non distinguatur. Primo istorum trium modorum fit disiunctio per *ve*, ut *Sortes Platoue currunt*, et in tali disiunctione, quia coniunctio respicit posterius extremorum prius et ipso mediante  
 340 reliquum, fit depressio velox versus coniunctionem attingendam, et propterea inclinatur accentus dictionis ad finalem sillabam, sicut patuit in copulatione. Secundo autem modo fit disiunctio per *vel* bis positum, ut si dicam, *vel Sortes vel Plato currit*, quia hic distinguitur disiunctio unius a disiunctione alterius, quia per primum *vel* notatur relatio, disiunctio Sortis ad Platonem, per secundum econ-  
 345 uerso. Tertio vero modo fit disiunctio per *vel* semel et in medio positum, ut *Sortes vel Plato currit*. Sic ergo manifestum est quod aliter notatur disiunctio per *vel* et per *ve*, et quomodo aliter, et qua ratione per *ve* fit inclinatio accentus et non per *vel*, quia *vel* non respicit utrumque disiunctorum precedentium tanquam ad ipsum inclinatum sicut hoc ipsum *ve* facit.

350 134. Consequenter dicendum est quod *ne* et *an* notant dubitationem differenter: quia *an* notat dubitationem precedendo illa circa que fit dubitatio aut inter que, sicut *tu scis an Sortes currit*; *ne* autem notat ipsam dubitationem subsequendo, ut *curritne Sortes*? Et sic *ne* respicit antecedens tanquam inclinatum ad ipsum, et ita fit depressio in dictione precedente usque in finalem sillabam, et ibi fit eleuatio;  
 355 *an* autem non hoc facit, quia non respicit precedens quod ad ipsum inclinatur set subsequens. Similiter autem significatio huius quod dico *an* respicit utrumque dubitatorum indifferenter; significatio autem eius quod dico *ne* per prius respicit

326 tota] et ita C      copulam] -lationem V      328 post] per V      attingendam] -dum V  
 329 inclinatur om. C      330 autem] quod V      331 deficiat] -cit V      huiusmodi] hec C  
 nec corr. ex alio C      333 similiter] sic C      334 notificatio] nota C      336 correlate] correla-  
 tive (?) V; copulate C      338 trium om. C      currunt] -rit V      339 coniunctio] disiunctio  
 C      prius] plus C      post et expunx. potest C      340 versus (finem add. et expunx.) C; verum  
 V      342 post vel! add. hic C      344 notatur relatio] denotatur C      Platonem] copulationem  
 C      346 disiunctio om. V      350 consequenter] similiter V      351 precedendo] -dere C  
 aut] vel V      352 sicut] sic C      dubitationem om. V      354 usque] neque V      finalem  
 sillabam] primam sillabam C: finalem sili V      356 dico] est C

alterum illorum, sicut patet intuenti si quis consideret, et propterea habet similem vim inclinandi ad se accentum precedentis dictionis qualem habet *que* et *ve*; hoc  
 360 autem ipsum *an* non habet, sicut nec *et* <nec> *vel*.

# <LECTIO 4>

135. SILLABA QUE CORREPTAM, etc. (II.10; 521.5) Postquam determinavit in qua parte dictionis incidit accentus, hic determinat Priscianus regulas accentuandi. Et diuiditur hec pars in duas: in quarum prima determinat regulas generales; in  
 5 secunda, speciales cum dicit, LATINA, etc. (III.14; 521.33)

136. Et prima itaque diuiditur in duas: quia primo determinat regulas generales; secundo ostendit quod arsis et thesis sunt necessaria ad hoc ut cognoscamus accentus secundum dictas regulas ubi dicit, AD HANC AUTEM REM, etc. (II.13; 521.24)

10 137. Item, prima istarum diuiditur in tres, quia primo ponit regulas accentuandi dictiones monosyllabas, secundo dissyllabas, tertio trisyllabas et tetrasyllabas et sic deinceps. Secunda pars incipit ibi, DISSILLABE VERO SI PRIOREM, etc. (II.11; 521.9); tertia ibi, TRISILLABE ET TETRASILLABE, etc.

138. In speciali sic procedit. Primo ponit regulam de modo accentuandi  
 15 dictiones monosyllabas, que talis est: si sit dictio monosyllaba, aut habet vocalem naturaliter productam aut alio modo, scilicet ita quod correptam vel productam positione; si naturaliter productam, debet circumflecti, ut *mos*, *dos*; si productam positione vel correptam, debet acui, ut *nux*, *pix*. Et hoc est quod dicit, SILLABA QUE CORREPTAM, etc. (II.10; 521.5)

20 139. Consequenter ponit regulam in dissyllabis dictionibus talem: si dictio fit dissyllaba, vel ergo prima naturaliter producta vel alio modo; si prima sit naturaliter producta, vel ergo ultima est correpta vel producta; si producta, acuetur prima, ut *nepos*; si correpta, circumflectetur, ut *meta*, *Creta*, etc.; si autem prima non sit naturaliter producta, quocumque alio modo se habeat, hoc est siue producta sit  
 25 positione siue correpta et siue tunc ultima sit brevis siue producta, acuetur semper. Et hoc est quod dicit, DISSILLABE VERO SI PRIOREM, etc. (II.11; 521.9)

358 intuenti] exemplariter V      habet] non querit C      359 que et ve] ne et que C  
 360 ipsum om. V

Lectio 4      2 que correptam] autem correpta V      3 Priscianus om. V      4 quarum om.  
 C      5 etc.] autem C      6 itaque diuiditur om. C      quia primo] in prima C      6-7 regulas  
 generales] has regulas V      7 arsis] arcis V      ut] quod V      8 accentus] -tum C  
 11 dictiones om. V      12 pars incipit om. C      si priorem etc.] si prior est etc. V: etc. C  
 15 dictiones om. V      16 ita quod om. C      vel] aut C      18 nux] nix (fort. recte?) C  
 quod dicit om. C      20 consequenter] communiter V      22 post est add. naturaliter C      25 sit  
 om. V      post brevis canc. correpta V      siue] vel V      26 quod dicit om. C

140. Consequenter ponit regulam in dictionibus polisillabis, dicens quod si dictio sit trisillaba vel tetrasillaba et sic deinceps, tunc igitur penultima vel est correpta vel producta; si correpta, tunc antepenultima acuetur semper et retinebit  
 30 accentum principalem, ut *Tullius*; si autem penultima fuerit producta, vel ergo natura vel positione; si positione, vel ergo ex muta et liquida vel alio modo; si sit longa positione alio modo quam per mutam et liquidam, / ipsa acuetur et C 26rb antepenultima grauabitur, ut *catellus*; si autem producatur positione ex muta et liquida, semper grauabitur in prosa et in sermone communi, et erit accentus supra  
 35 antepenultimam. Et sumatur productio secundum positionem communiter secundum quod sillaba producitur propter positionem duarum consonantium immediate post vocalem siue altera colliteretur cum vocali siue neutra: sic enim dicitur sillaba producta positione que producitur per mutam et liquidam. In metro non enim poterit ultima produci, ut *tenebre*, *latebre*. Si autem penultima fuerit producta  
 40 natura, inspiciendum est ad ultimam, utrum sit correpta vel producta: si sit correpta, circumflectetur penultima, ut *Cetegus*; si autem fuerit producta, penultima acuetur, ut *Athene*. Et hoc est quod dicit, TRISILLABE ET TETRASILLABE (II.12; 521.16).

141. Consequenter ostendit quod ad completum accentum faciendum et  
 45 designandum necessarij sunt arsis et thesis, hoc est eleuatio et depressio. Et quia eleuatio et depressio non solum consistunt in ordinatione litterarum vel sillabarum adinuicem set in pronuntiatione dictionum, et addit ad hoc ostendendum quod tota vox in dictione precedens eleuationem principalis accentus in dictione debetur eleuationi, tota autem vox que subsequitur eleuationem principalis accentus in  
 50 dictione debetur depressioni. Vnde eleuatio cadit intus in sillaba supra quam cadit principalis accentus; depressio vero cadit deforis, hoc est extra sillabam principalis accentus. Et hoc ostendit in hac dictione *natura*, quia quod in hac dictione precedit mediam sillabam debetur eleuationi et cadit intus super illam sillabam; vos autem subsequens depressioni, et cadit deforis extra mediam. Et hoc est quod dicit, AD  
 55 HANC AUTEM REM (II.13; 521.24).

142. Circa iam dicta incidit dubitatio, et primo circa primam regulam. Dicit enim si monosillaba dictio habeat vocalem naturaliter productam, circumflectetur; si non, grauatur. Sic igitur supponit aliquam sillabam esse correptam et aliquam

27 quod om. V    28 trisillaba] dis- V    29 tunc om. V    30 autem penultima]  
 antepenultima C    31 si<sup>1</sup> positione om. V    33 producatur] producta V    35 positionem]  
 speciem C    38 non enim] autem V    40 natura] notatur C    utrum] tunc C  
 41 Cetegus] dedecus C    42 quod dicit om. C    45 necessarij] -ria C    arsis] arcis V  
 45-46 quia...depressio om. C    48 in<sup>2</sup> dictione<sup>2</sup> om. V    49-50 tota...depressioni om. C  
 52 ostendit] est C    quod om. V    53 post sillabam<sup>1</sup> add. que V    super] supra V  
 54 depressioni] -nem C    quod dicit om. C    57 dictio om. V    habeat] hanc C  
 58 supponit] ponit C

esse productam, et ita supponit tempus aliquod esse productum et aliquod  
 60 correptum. Set videtur quod omne tempus sit productum et quod omne sit  
 correptum. Quod omne tempus sit productum sic ostenditur: tempus productum  
 est quod constat ex duobus temporibus in que diuidi potest; set omne tempus, cum  
 sit continuum, poterit sic diuidi, quia omne continuum diuisibile in infinitum; ergo  
 omne tempus est productum. Quod autem omne tempus sit correptum sic  
 65 ostenditur: tempus correptum est ex quo et alio fit productum; set omne tempus  
 est huiusmodi, scilicet quod ex ipso et alio fit tempus maius siue productum; ergo  
 omne tempus est productum.

143. Ad hoc [142] dicendum est quod primo intelligendum est quid sit  
 tempus productum hic et quid correptum. Dicitur autem *tempus correptum* in quo  
 70 generatur vocalis vel sillaba aliqua ita quod non possit generari in minori ad hoc  
 quod saluetur species ipsius littere vel sillabe; *tempus vero productum* dicitur iam  
 dicti correpti geminatio temporis.

144. Ad hoc autem quod dicit quod omne continuum est diuisibile in infini-  
 V 107va tum, et tempus / est huiusmodi, etc., dicendum quod tempus secundum se et per  
 75 naturam propriam diuisibile est in infinitum, set in comparatione ad formam vocis  
 prolate in tempore non est diuisibile in infinitum; potest tamen aliquid esse in se  
 diuisibile in infinitum, in comparatione tamen ad formam rei simpliciter vel ad  
 formam relatum ad motum non est diuisibile in infinitum. Verbi gratia, caro  
 secundum suam quantitatem siue secundum quod quanta diuisibilis est in infinitum.  
 80 Si tamen diuidatur actu, contingit deuenire ad quantitatem quam non est ultra  
 diuidere ad hoc quod maneat forma et species carnis. Similiter autem et ignis  
 diuisibilis est secundum quantitatem et in infinitum. Si tamen diuidatur actu,  
 aliquando indiuisibilis est ratione speciei relate ad motum. Contingit enim per  
 diuisionem deuenire ad minimum in igne, quod, et si habeat formam ignis et  
 85 speciem et possit ulterius diuidi manente forma et specie ignis, non potest tamen  
 ulterius diuidi per species ita quod maneat motus sursum: et ita quoad formam  
 relatum ad motum est aliquando ignis indiuisibilis, qui tamen de se est diuisibilis  
 in infinitum. Sic autem est et in successiuis, sicut in voce et in tempore commensu-  
 rante ipsam, quod quamuis tempus secundum se in infinitum sit diuisibile, tamen  
 90 considerando ad vocem quam mensurat, manifestum est quod contingit vocem  
 generari in aliquo tempore tam paruo quod si generaretur in minori, non saluaretur

59 ita] sic C    59-60 et<sup>2</sup>...correptum om. C    61 quod om. V    sit om. V    64 autem  
 om. V    65 fit] sic C    66 maius] magis V    68 sit om. V    69 hic om. C    post quid  
 add. sit tempus C    dicitur...correptum<sup>2</sup> om. C    71 quod] autem V    saluetur] seruetur V  
 72 geminatio (corr. in marg. ex generatio) temporis C: generatio V    73 quod<sup>2</sup> om. V  
 74 etc.] et V    76 tempore] specie C    in<sup>2</sup> om. C    potest tamen] predicatur enim C  
 77 diuisibile om. C    78 relatum om. C    79 quantitatem] quali- C    quanta diuisibilis]  
 quantum diuisibile C    80 actu om. V    deuenire] proue- V    non corr. ex non et ideo C  
 81 diuidere] deuenire V    84 igne] genere V    88 sic] sicut V    89 quod om. V  
 91 tam] tamen V



in ipsa species vocis. Et tale tempus dicitur hic *correptum*, et huius geminatio constituit tempus productum. Sic igitur manifestum est quod non omne tempus est productum quia de se possit diuidi in infinitum, quia sic non sumitur hic *tempus*  
 95 *productum* set pro geminato tempore correpto, sicut dictum est [143], vel secundum quod tempus est diuisibile non in se set in comparatione ad vocem, siue per speciem et formam vocis: sic autem non est diuisibile in infinitum. Et sic patet primo obiectum [142<sup>1</sup>].

145. Ad secundum obiectum [142<sup>2</sup>], quod dicit, omne tempus ex quo et alio  
 100 potest fieri productum est breue, set omne tempus est tale, dicendum quod non dicitur hic omne illud tempus esse correptum ex quo et alio componi possit tertium, set solum illud in quo profertur vox aliqua et impossibile est ipsam proferri in minori ad hoc quod saluetur species et forma vocis.

146. Consequenter queritur circa hoc / quod dicit sillabam naturaliter corrip  
 105 vel produci; queritur enim quid sit naturaliter dici correptum vel productum et unde sillaba hoc dicitur habere. C 26va

147. Opponitur autem hoc modo contra hoc. Sicut dicit Aristotiles in *Phisicis*, *natura* dicitur duobus modis, scilicet quedam materia et quedam forma. Si ergo vox producatur naturaliter, hoc erit propter materiam vel propter formam. Si propter  
 110 materiam; set materia vocis naturaliter producte vel correpte cuiusmodi est sillaba non est aliud quam consonans vel quam consonantes: quare si dicatur naturaliter produci propter materiam, dicetur hoc propter consonantes que sunt materialia ad sillabam. Set constat quod hoc falsum est, quia si aliqua consonans naturaliter faceret sillabam aliquam productam, similiter faceret omnem sillabam productam  
 115 in qua poneretur: set hoc esse non potest. Si autem dicatur quod sillaba dicatur produci naturaliter propter suam formam, contra: forma sillabe est aliqua vocalis sicut *a* vel *e*, etc.; set forma substantialis cuiuslibet specialis littere que est *a* una et eadem est specie, similiter et forma cuiuslibet specialis vocalis que est *e* una et eadem specie; si ergo dicatur sillabam produci propter formam substantialem  
 120 vocalis in ipsa que est eius forma, cum forma sit eadem secundum speciem, tunc semper tempus, cum ei debeat propter talem formam semper, produceretur; quare si una vocalis aliquando producta est, et semper producta erit; quod est manifeste falsum.

107-108 cf. Arist., *Ph.* 2.1 (193a28-31).

92 huius] huiusmodi *V* geminatio] generatio *CV* 93 post productum *add. et canc. per*  
 'vacat' quia de se possit diuidi in infinitum et sic non sumitur hic tempus productum *V* 94 quia<sup>2</sup>  
 et *V* hic *om. C* 95 vel *om. V* 96 tempus *om. C* per *om. C* 100 post dicendum  
*add. enim V* 101 illud *om. C* 105 vel<sup>1</sup>] et *V* dici...productum] coripi vel naturaliter  
 produci *C* 106 unde] quando *C* 107 sicut *om. C* 109 producatur] -citur *V*  
*materiam corr. ex naturam C* 110 cuiusmodi] eius *C* 111 quam<sup>2</sup> *om. V* 114 faceret<sup>1</sup>]  
 faciat *V* 116 contra] consequenter *C* 118-119 similiter...specie *om. V* 120 post voca-  
 lis *add. aut V* 121 tempus] ipsa vocalis *C* 122 post aliquando *expunx. longa C*

148. Ad hoc [147] dicendum quod *natura* tripliciter dicitur, duobus modis  
 125 magis proprie et principalius et tertio modo minus proprie, et illo tertio modo  
 dicitur sillaba produci natura vel corripri et non primis duobus. Set secundum illos  
 duos modos dicendi *naturam* procedunt obiectiones. Ad hoc ostendendum sic:  
 natura uno modo idem est quod forma et alio modo idem quod materia; et neutro  
 istorum modorum sumendi *naturam* dicitur sillaba produci natura vel corripri,  
 130 quoniam neque secundum consonantem, que est eius materia, neque secundum  
 vocalem, que est eius forma, sicut probauerunt rationes in opponendo; tertio vero  
 modo et minus proprie dicitur *natura* illud quod est motus ad naturam, sicut  
 generatio que est via ad naturam et motus dicitur *natura*; et hoc modo dicitur  
 sillaba naturaliter produci, scilicet quia propter suam generationem recipit pro-  
 135 ductionem, non tamen absolute sic set secundum quod recipit ordinationem in suo  
 toto sicut in dictione; similiter sillaba dicitur naturaliter corripri que per sui  
 generationem recipit correptionem, non absolute set secundum quod habet  
 ordinationem in dictione inposita ad significandum, cuiusmodi dictionis ipsa est  
 pars.

140 149. Quod autem non absolute a sua generatione recipiat sillaba suam  
 productionem et correptionem set in quantum habet ordinationem in dictione  
 manifestum est: aliter enim possemus sine vitio facere quamcumque sillabam  
 indifferenter productam et correptam, generando ipsam producte vel correpte.

150 150. Item, idem patet hoc modo: tempus, ut dictum est [38], est motus  
 145 mediante quo generatur sillaba, sub maiori impulsu aeris si sit longa, sub minori vel  
 minimo si sit correpta; unde si dictio inponatur ad significandum, et generatio  
 alicuius vocalis in ipsa fiat in tempore minimo sicut dictum est, tempus sillabe  
 correpte accipis; si in generatione alicuius vocalis illius dictionis fiat minima vel  
 simplex aeris impulsio, talis vocalis mediante tali impulsu dicitur corripri et habere  
 150 tempus correptum; si autem aliqua vocalis in tali dictione, cum inponatur ad  
 significandum, generetur sub tempore vel impulsu duplicato, sic dicitur illa vocalis  
 produci et mediante tali impulsu habere duplex tempus ad tempus correptum, vel  
 productum, quod idem est. Sic igitur manifestum est quare et secundum quam  
 naturam dicitur sillaba corripri vel produci naturaliter, et etiam obiectiones facte  
 155 [147] excluduntur sicut patet.

132-133 cf. *ibid.* (193b12-13).

---

124 tripliciter *om. C* post modis *add. proprie et C* 125 modo<sup>1</sup> *om. V* 126 natura  
*om. V* 127 duos *om. V* ad *om. V* 128 post natura *add. dicitur V* 130 quoniam]  
 quia *V* 131 rationes] positiones *C* vero *om. V* 132 illud] id *C* 133 dicitur<sup>1</sup>] est  
*C* 134 naturaliter] natura *V* 136-137 sui generationem] significationem *C* 140 reci-  
 piat] susci- *V* suam *om. C* 142 quamcumque] quantamcumque *V* 144 idem] hoc *C*  
 147 tempus] spiritus (*vel species?*) *C* post sillabe *add. vel V* 148 accipis si] -pi vel *C*  
 fiat] stat *C* 150 aliqua] ita *C* 151 impulsu] pulsu *C* duplicato] duplici *C*  
 152 habere] -retur *V* vel] et *V*

151. Consequenter queritur de tempore producto positione quare due consonantes sequentes vocalem producant ipsam et que sit huius causa.

152. Item, cum hoc queritur quare productio secundum positionem non sufficit ad sustentationem accentus circumflexi sicut productio secundum naturam.

160 Videtur enim quod inmo hac ratione: accentus circumflexus acuitur in principio versus sursum et terminatur in deorsum et in depressione; similiter autem in generatione consonantium est quod fit depressio et motus deorsum, quia generantur in clausione; et huiusmodi generatio consonantium facit sillabam produci positione et non naturaliter; quare hac conuenientia videtur quod magis habeat  
165 sillaba longa positione circumflecti quam sillaba longa naturaliter.

153. Ad primum [151] dicendum est quod due consonantes sequentes vocalem producant vocalem illam propter moram que fieri debet in sui generatione — et hoc dico si altera vel utraque collitteretur cum vocali; aliter enim non generat mora in generatione consonantium moram in vocali precedente. Sciendum ergo  
170 quod vocales generantur in apertione et consonantes in clausione, ut dicit Priscianus. Set sola clausione non fit vox quod patet si proferatur unica consonans, in eius prolatione precedit vocalis et fit apertio. Quando ergo due consonantes sequuntur vocalem, in utriusque generatione naturaliter fit clausio; quia vero proferri / non possunt sine apertione necessario fit clausio. Vnde in generatione prime C 26vb  
175 consonantis clauduntur instrumenta et deprimuntur; et in generatione secunde consonantis, ad hoc quod fiat vox, necesse est fieri apertionem et non solum clausionem. Vnde, cum apertio fiat per eleuationem instrumentorum grauium, et ita per uiolentiam, necesse est ibi fieri moram, quia post clausionem factam statim fit apertio ad generandum secundam consonantem: propterea igitur vocalis precedens collitterata cum altera vel utraque extenditur in generatione / sua per V 107vb  
180 moram generationis consonantium et fit longa.

154. Ad secundum [152] dicendum est quod principalis accentus est ad hoc ut uniantur partes dictionis et accipiantur tanquam unum materiale respectu

170-171 fort. sub iisdem verbis non inuenitur in operibus Prisciani, sed. cf. Kilwardby, *In Donati Artem maiorem III*, ed. L. Schmücker (Brixen, 1984), p. 34.1088-90: 'Qualiter autem sonoritas et insonoritas in littera comparata ad aliam causatur ex proportionem et improportionem soni, sic manifestatur: uocales generantur in apertione, consonantes in clausione....'

157 producant] -cunt V 158 productio] -tum C non om. C 160 inmo] in illo V  
161 in<sup>1</sup> om. V 162 fit] sit C 167 illam om. C propter] per C que] quam C debet]  
oportet C 168-169 non...in<sup>1</sup>] non generat mora V: agenerat in C 171 quod] sicut C  
172 precedit] primi cedit C ergo] autem C 173 naturaliter om. C clausio] -sula C  
vero om. C 174 possunt] -sit V necessario] naturaliter C 175 instrumenta] -to V  
in generatione] ad -nem V 176 apertionem] a per rationem C 177 fiat] fit C 178 fac-  
tam om. V 179 igitur] autem C 180 utraque] intra quod C 182 ad hoc om. V

- significationis inponende; et propterea, quia ipse est ad hoc uniendum, fundari  
 185 habet super aliquod unum primo et per se; hoc autem non erit nisi vocalis vel  
 consonans; consonans autem esse non potest, cum neque sonum faciat neque  
 accentum sibi vendicet, propterea quia vox et sonus subici habent accentui et ipsa  
 consonans non facit vocem: et propterea necesse est accentum fieri supra aliquam  
 190 vocalem unam productam vel correptam. Ad hoc autem quod sit una vocalis supra  
 quam debet fieri circumflexus, oportet quod sit natura producta; ad hoc autem  
 quod fiat acutus accentus, non oportet, inmo supra longam siue naturaliter siue  
 positione et etiam supra correptam fieri potest accentus acutus. Et huius ostensio  
 talis est. Circumflexus consistit in eleuatione et depressione; ad hoc autem quod  
 eleuatio et depressio sint supra idem, ut supra eandem litteram, exigitur duplex  
 195 tempus, quia utraque in unico tempore, nisi fuerit productum, fieri non potest  
 simul; unde necesse est quod illa vocalis que accipere debet circumflexum accen-  
 tum habeat tempus productum; unde licet aliqua vocalis producatur positione, cum  
 supra ipsam vocalem unam et eandem fieri habeant et eleuatio et depressio ut iam  
 dictum est, si ipsa vocalis fuerit brevis, supra ipsam fieri non potest accentus  
 200 circumflexus: et sic patet causa quare circumflexus accentus non potest fieri nisi in  
 littera naturaliter longa. Acutus autem accentus consistit in sola eleuatione que in  
 unico tempore supra unam litteram fieri bene contingit; unde cum omnis vocalis  
 vel sillaba habeat unum tempus ad minus, potest omnis vocalis et omnis sillaba  
 sustentare accentum acutum.
- 205 155. Ex hiis iam patet responsio ad obiectum [152]; quamuis enim sillaba  
 longa positione terminetur per consonantem, et generatio consonantis terminetur  
 in depressione sicut accentus circumflexus, tamen hoc non contingit quod in sillaba  
 tali fieri debeat talis accentus, quia supra eandem litteram numero et antequam alia  
 generetur in voce oportet fieri eleuationem et depressionem ubicumque debet fieri  
 210 circumflexus accentus; unde subsequens generatio consonantium facere non potest  
 quod circumflectatur illa vocalis si naturaliter fuerit correpta. Ex iam dictis  
 manifesta est solutio huius questionis: cum tempus diuidatur per correptum et  
 productum, quare sillaba habens tempus correptum potest acui, non autem  
 circumflecti.
- 215 156. Consequenter restat querere de regulis accentuandi quas dat de dissyllabis  
 et polisyllabis similiter, scilicet si penultima fuerit producta naturaliter et ultima  
 correpta, penultima circumflectetur; si autem penultima sit producta natura et

184 hoc uniendum] hoc merendum C: unandum hoc modo V      185 super] supra V  
 187 vendicet] -casset V      accentui] -tum C      ipsa] propterea C      194 post exigitur add. ad  
 hoc V      195 quia utraque] uterque C      198 habeant] habeat C      200 accentus om. V  
 206 consonantem] consequens V      207 contingit] cognoscitur V      208-209 alia generetur  
 corr. ex autem genera C      209 debet] debeat V      216 scilicet om. V      fuerit] est V  
 naturaliter] natura V      217 penultima<sup>2</sup>] antepe- C

ultima producta, acuetur et non circumflectetur: queritur huius causa. Videtur enim quod dicit falsum, quia cum circumflexus accentus non exigit nisi sillabam  
 220 naturaliter productam, videtur quod siue ultima fuerit correpta siue producta, dummodo penultima sit longa natura, quod supra ipsam possit fieri accentus circumflexus.

157. Item, circumflexus accentus determinat sibi sillabam naturaliter productam; ergo productio confert et ad hoc quod sit circumflexus accentus; ergo ultima  
 225 existente producta, magis circumflectetur penultima existens producta quam ultima existens correpta.

158. Et dicendum est quod ultima existente producta non potest penultima circumflecti, et huius causa est quod accentus circumflexus non patitur post se in eadem dictione duas sillabas breues, et una sillaba producta equipollet duabus  
 230 breuibz, propterea non patitur post se circumflexus accentus unam productam. Causa autem quare non patitur duas sillabas breues post se est quia non patitur post suam eleuationem nisi duplicem depressionem. Vnde cum post eleuationem factam in ipso circumflexo adhuc sit in eadem depressio, non erit post ipsum nisi una sillaba depressa vel una depressio, / et ita non patitur post se duas sillabas breues C 27ra  
 235 nec unam productam, que eis equipollet. Item, causa quare non patitur post se nisi duplicem depressionem est quia principalis accentus, cum non possit esse in fine, attenditur tamen in relatione ad finem, maxime secundum quod potest debet esse propinquus fini; set propinquus fini non esset si sequeretur ipsum magis quam una depressio vel duplex: unde post eleuationem principalis accentus non ponitur nisi  
 240 unica vel duplex depressio, unica ut quando penultima acuitur, duplex ut quando penultima circumflectitur vel antepenultima acuitur.

159. Ad primum obiectum [156] dicendum quod circumflexus exigit sillabam naturaliter productam non quocumque modo set subsequente sillaba breui: unde non solum exigit sillabam naturaliter productam set etiam ita quod subsequatur  
 245 sillaba breuis.

160. Ad aliud [157] dicendum quod cum dicit, productio confert ad accentum circumflexum, quod aliquando sic et aliquando non: confert enim productio ad circumflexum si sit in eadem sillaba cum circumflexo; non confert autem si sit extra illam sillabam.

250 165. Set dubitatur ex hoc quod supposuit solutio [158], scilicet quod tantum

218 huius] igitur C      219 dicit] dicat V      cum om. C      220 naturaliter] natura ut V  
 221 natura] -raliter V      possit] -set V      223 sibi om. C      226 existens] -tente V  
 230 circumflexus accentus om. et canc. per 'vacat' in eadem dictione duas sillabas breues V  
 233 eadem] eodem C      non corr. ex et ideo C      235 nec] vel C      236 post possit canc.  
 attendatur in relatione V      237 attenditur] -datur V      in relatione] inclusione C  
 238 propinquus<sup>1,2</sup>] -quius V      si om. C      239 vel duplex om. C      244 non...productam om.  
 V      subsequatur] -queretur V      246 aliud] alterum V      248 sit<sup>2</sup>] fuerit V      250 post  
 § 160 suspicor lacunam quatuor paragraphorum      set om. V      solutio] secunda C

duplex depressio fieri debet post principalem accentum et quod sillaba longa habet quasi duas depressiones, tunc enim videtur quod antepenultima non possit acui ultima existente producta: tunc enim sequitur triplex depressio principalem accentum.

255 166. Et dicendum quod eleuatio acuti accentus bene potest post se triplicem depressionem habere dicto modo set non eleuatio circumflexi; cuius causa est quod accentus circumflexus de sui natura determinat sibi depressionem, acutus autem non determinat sibi depressionem: unde non tantum intenditur duplex depressio post acutum sicut post circumflexum, et sic non tantam facit insonoritatem neque  
260 turpem sonum nimie depressionis.

167. Consequenter queritur quare non multiplicantur regule docentes modum accentuandi penes diuisionem polisillabarum deinceps a tetrasillabis sicut multiplicantur penes monosillabas, dissillabas, trisillabas et tetrasillabas.

168. Ad quod [167] dicendum quod in hiis tribus, monosyllabis, dissyllabis et  
265 trisyllabis, dissimilis est modus accentuandi, et in aliis deinceps similis, et hoc patet sic: in monosyllabis diuersificatur accentus, set hoc est supra litteram eandem semper et in eadem sillaba, nec fit ibi variatio penes distinctionem principalis accentus a non principali; in dissyllabis vero multiplicatur accentus penes syllabas, et diuersificatur ibi consideratio ad ostendendum que sillaba debeat principalem  
270 habere accentum et que non principalem; in trisyllabis autem adhuc diuersus est modus considerandi accentum ab hiis modis qui sunt in monosyllabis et dissyllabis, quia in monosyllabis non cadit nisi supra unum locum semper, similiter in dissyllabis semper cadit accentus principalis in una sillaba nisi sit differentie causa, ut dictum est [95]; in trisyllabis vero et sic deinceps potest cadere super locos  
275 diuersos, et consequenter in omnibus modis deinceps sumendi dictiones polisillabas similis est modus considerandi accentum; in omnibus enim deinceps sicut et in trisyllabis semper cadit accentus principalis supra penultimam vel antepenultimam. Et sic patet quod in monosyllabis et dissyllabis et trisyllabis diuersimode consideratur locus accentus; in aliis vero deinceps simili modo ei qui fit in  
280 trisyllabis, et propterea non multiplicantur regule accentuum siue cognoscendi  
V 108ra locum accentus in polisillabis / aliis deinceps a trisyllabis sicut in monosyllabis, dissyllabis et trisyllabis.

169. Set tunc superest questio hic quare principalis accentus in aliis dictionibus, trisyllabis et deinceps, semper cadit in loco penultimo vel in antepenultimo.

256 cuius] huius V 257 circumflexus om. V 258 duplex] triplex V 259 neque] in  
V 261 docentes] di- V 262 tetrasillabis] trisil- C 262-263 multiplicantur] -catur V  
264 quod<sup>1</sup>] hoc C 265 similis] facis C 266 sic] sicut C set om. C 269 ibi om.  
C 270 autem om. C 272-273 in<sup>2</sup> dissyllabis] et V 274 vero om. C super] supra  
V 275 sumendi] -do V 277 supra] super V 280 accentuum siue om. V 281 a]  
cum C in<sup>2</sup>] a V 283 aliis] hiis V 284 in<sup>2</sup> om. V

285 Huius autem solutio prius habita est ubi determinatum est quare principalis  
accentus semper debet cadere supra penultimam vel antepenultimam sillabam  
[107, 110].

170. Item, queritur de hoc quod dicit, in trisyllabis quando penultima est  
correpta, antepenultima semper acuitur et seruat sibi accentum principalem; set ex  
290 quo antepenultima potest esse correpta sicut et penultima queritur tunc: quando  
utraque illarum est brevis, quare magis accentus principalis cadit supra antepe-  
nultimam quam supra penultimam.

171. Et dicendum quod hoc [170] est propter maiorem discretionem tem-  
porum, quia maior est discretio temporum utraque, scilicet tam penultima quam  
295 penultima existente correpta, si antepenultima acuatur quam si acuiatur penultima.  
Et hoc sic perspicendum est: hec dictio *legere* corripitur in penultima et antepenul-  
tima; si ergo supra penultimam fieret accentus, non determinaretur utrum fuerit  
brevis vel longa, quia tam longa quam brevis potest acui; set cum fit accentus in  
antepenultima, determinatur per prolationem ipsam penultimam breuem esse.

300 172. Consequenter queritur circa ultimam particulam lectionis, ubi dicit quod  
quando aliqua dictio regatur principali accentu, tunc eleuatio cadit intus supra  
sillabam habentem principalem accentum et depressio extra eandem cadit. Hoc  
autem videtur falsum in accentu circumflexo; in accentu enim circumflexo simul  
est eleuatio et depressio: quare supra eandem sillabam supra quam cadit eleuatio  
305 et principalis accentus, supra eandem cadit depressio, et ita depressio non cadit  
deforis extra illam sillabam in qua / fit accentus principalis set intus.

C 27rb

173. Huius [172] autem solutio habetur per litteram sequentem, que dicit  
quod totum debetur arsi donec perficiatur principalis accentus: quare, cum illa  
depressio que est pars accentus circumflexi fit perfectio principalis accentus,  
310 constat quod ipsa debetur arsi, hoc est eleuationi. Hoc autem quod dixit ante quod  
depressio cadit deforis et extra sillabam principalis accentus, intelligendum est de  
depressionem cadente extra perfectionem principalis accentus. Et sic cessat obiectio.

## &lt;LECTIO 5&gt;

174. LATINA QUIDEM NOMINA, etc. (III.14; 521.33) Determinato de regulis  
generalibus cognoscendi accentus, in hac parte determinat de regulis specialibus

300-302 *De acc.* II.13 (p. 521.25-29).  
(p. 521.27-28).

307-308 *ibid.* (p. 521.29-30).

310-311 *ibid.*

285 prius] superius V    285-286 quare...accentus] quod C    289 sibi om. C    290 tunc  
om. V    293 propter om. V    294 temporum om. V    295 acuatur] acuiatur V  
296 legere] legitur V    297 si om. C    298 fit] sit C    299 breuem esse] quid C, incertum  
301 intus] intra C    302 extra eandem] ex eadem V    303 accentu<sup>2</sup> om. V  
306 deforis] foris C    illam om. C    308 quod om. V    arsi] arci V    310 arsi] arci V  
post ante add. secundum C

cognoscendi eosdem. Et sciendum quod ad cognoscendum accentum et in quo  
 5 loco habeat fieri, cum hoc dependeat a quantitate sillabarum penultimarum sicut  
 patet ex regulis supradictis, oportet scire quantitatem penultimarum: propterea in  
 hac parte intendit ponere regulas facientes cognoscere quantitates sillabarum  
 penultimarum singularium dictionum. Et diuiditur hec pars in duas: in quarum  
 prima determinat Priscianus regulas accentuandi et similiter cognoscendi penulti-  
 10 mas in partibus declinabilibus; deinde, in indeclinabilibus cum dicit, ADUERBIA SI,  
 etc. (VII.47; 528.23)

175. Et prima pars diuiditur in quatuor: in quarum prima determinat regulas  
 accentuandi nomina; in secunda, regulas accentuandi verba cum dicit, REGULIS  
 ACCENTUUM NOMINUM, etc. (V.36; 526.16); in tertia determinat regulas accentuandi  
 15 participia cum dicit, PARTICIPIUM NAMQUE, etc. (VII.45; 528.14); in quarta parte,  
 regulas accentuandi pronomina cum dicit, PRONOMEN VERO ISTUD, etc. (VII.46;  
 528.16)

176. Item, prima istarum diuiditur in duas: in quarum prima determinat  
 regulas accentuandi nomina terminantia in vocales; in secunda, terminantia in  
 20 consonantes cum dicit, AL SILLABA FINITA, etc. (III.20; 523.6)

177. Et prima istarum diuiditur in quinque partes iuxta quinque vocales,  
 quarum quilibet potest aliquod nomen finire, et in prima parte determinat regulas  
 accentuandi nomina terminantia in *a*, secundo in *e*, tertio in *i*, quarto in *o*, quinto  
 in *u*. Partes per se patent.

25 178. Consequenter illa pars in qua determinat regulas accentuandi nomina  
 terminantia in consonantes diuiditur in duas: in quarum prima dat regulas accen-  
 tuandi nomina terminantia in unam consonantem; in secunda dat regulas accen-  
 tuandi nomina terminantia in plures consonantes cum dicit, QUE IN DUAS CONSO-  
 NANTES, etc. (IV.35; 526.10)

30 179. Item, prima istarum diuiditur in partes duas: in quarum prima dat regulas  
 accentuandi nomina terminantia in semiuocales; deinde, terminantia in mutas cum  
 dicit, CUM T LITTERA TERMINATA, etc. (IV.35; 526.7)

180. Item, prima istarum diuiditur in sex partes iuxta sex semiuocales: in  
 quarum prima determinat regulas accentuandi nomina terminantia in *l*; in secunda,  
 35 terminantia in *m* cum dicit, UM TERMINATA, etc. (III.22; 523.14); in tertia, terminan-

4 cognoscendum accentum] cognicionem accentus V 5 habeat] habet V 6 supradictis]  
 supra datis V 7 quantitates] -tem V 8 singularium] sillabarum C hec pars om. C  
 9 Priscianus om. V regulas...similiter] regularum accentum (et similiter expunx.) C  
 10 deinde] in secunda C indeclinabilibus] non declinabilibus V 14 nominum etc. om. C  
 determinat] parte C 15 namque etc.] vero C 16 pronomen...etc.] pronomina quoque  
 C 19 terminantia<sup>1, 2</sup>] -nata C 20 post finita add. et prima V 22 parte om. C  
 23 terminantia om. V secundo] -da C 27-28 dat...accentuandi om. C 28 que in duas  
 om. C 30 partes om. V quarum om. C 31 cum] tria C 32 terminata etc. om. C  
 33 partes om. C 35 terminantia om. C um] in m C 35-36 terminantia om. C



tia in *n* cum dicit, EN SILLABA FINITA (III.22; 523.15); in quarta, terminantia in *r* cum dicit, AR SILLABA TERMINATA, etc. (III.23; 523.21); in quinta, terminantia in *s* cum dicit, AS SILLABA FINITA, etc. (III.26; 524.8); in sexta determinat regulas accentuandi nomina terminantia in *x* cum dicit, AX SILLABA TERMINATA, etc. (III.33; 40 525.30)

181. Prima vero istarum partium diuiditur in quinque particulas iuxta hoc quod huic littere *l* in fine dictionis potest preponi aliqua quinque vocalium, sic: *al*, *el*, *ol*, etc.: particule per se patent. Secunda sex dictarum partium, que est de dictionibus terminatis in *m*, indiuisa est et tertia similiter, que est de dictionibus 45 terminatis in *n*. Quarta vero et quinta et sexta dictarum sex partium possunt diuidi in quinque partes iuxta hoc quod aliqua quinque vocalium potest preponi huic littere *r* vel *s* vel *x* in fine dictionis, sic: *ar*, *er*, *or*, etc.; similiter, *as*, *es*, etc.; similiter, *ax*, *ex*, *ox*, etc. Inceptiones autem harum particularium patent per se.

182. In speciali sic procedit, primo ponendo regulam accentuandi nomina 50 terminantia in *a*. Et sciendum quod omnes regule quas ponit sunt ad discernendum quantitatem ipsius penultime sillabe, et hac mediante sunt ad cognoscendum sonum principalis accentus. Regula talis est extrahenda per diuisionem: si nomen terminetur in *a*, aut est proprium aut commune; si proprium, producitur in penultima non natura set usu vel differentie causa, ut *Maria*, *Stephania*; si sit 55 commune, aut Grecum aut Latinum; si Grecum, producit penultimam, ut *yronia*, *sophia*, etc., et hec adhuc nomina natura non producuntur set usu cum sint aliena vocabula; si sit Latinum, vel ergo simplex vel compositum; si compositum, vel ergo ab hoc verbo *cano* vel *gigno* vel *colo*, et hec corripiunt penultimam, ut *tybicina*, *alienigena*, *ruricola*, set *tybicen*, quod non desinit in *a*, producit penultimam; vel 60 componitur ab aliquo alio verbo ab hiis verbis, et de hiis non dicit nisi supponendo per hoc quod determinat communiter de terminantibus in *a*, dicens quod composita seruant talem regulam pronuntiandi qualem habent in simplice; si autem nomen desinens in *a* sit simplex, / vel ergo habet vocalem ante *a*, et tunc corripit V 108rb penultimam, ut *iustitia*, vel consonantem; et si sic, vel ergo habet *r* ante *a* ut desinit 65 in *ra*, et sic simile est participio et producit penultimam, ut *scriptura*, *natura*; vel

61-62 *De acc.* III.14 (p. 522.1-2).

36 terminantia] -nata C    37 ar] er C    38 determinat] dat C    41 in rep. V  
particulas] -lis C    42-43 sic...ol] sicut...ol C: sic a e i o u V    44 in m] per en V    indiuisa]  
di- C    45 post terminatis rep. in m diuisa est et tertia similiter que est de dictionibus terminatis  
C    in] per V    dictarum sex] dicta nouem V    46 aliqua] dicit C    quinque vocalium  
per modum lemmatis C    47 similiter om. V    48 autem om. V    particularium] minutarum  
partium V    49 sic om. V    50 terminantia] -nata C    51 hac] hoc CV    52 sonum]  
sicut C    45 post regula add. ista V    55 penultimam] -tima in marg. (al. man.) C    56 nomina  
om. V    producuntur] -centur C    59 alienigena] aurigena C    post a rep. quod non desinit  
in a V    60 verbo om. V    62 seruant] genera C    post talem add. habent C    64 habet]  
habent C

C 27<sup>va</sup> habet *n* ante *a*, / et producitur similiter, ut *Romana*, *Hyspana*, excepto *timpana*; vel habet *c* ante *a* ita quod non antecedit *i*, et corripitur, ut *Cretica*, exceptis tamen *vesica*, *formica* et similibus; vel habet *d* ante *a*, et corripitur, ut *frigida*. Nec tamen dicit aliquid de hiis que habent *d* ante *a*, vel aliam consonantem ab *r* et *n* ante *a*, 70 quia sufficienter per regulam de hiis intelligitur. De hiis que in obliquitate dicit quod in omnibus hiis seruandus est accentus in obliquis in illo loco ubi seruatur in rectis. Hanc autem regulam tradit modo confuso cum dicit, LATINA VERO NOMINA, etc. (III.14; 521.33)

183. Consequenter ponit regulam de nominibus terminantibus in *e*, que 75 particularis est, dicens quod nomen desinens in *e*, terminatum in *ile*, producit penultimam si sit substantium, ut *monile*, *sedile* (et forte erit instantia in hoc nomine *gausape*) si autem sit adiectivum habens consonantem inter *a* et *e*, producitur similiter, ut *verbale*, *singulare*. De reliquis autem, ut sunt *utensile*, *risibile*, etc., nichil dicit. Vnde, si obiciatur contra hanc regulam quod sit diminuta, 80 vel contra aliquam aliam quam ponit, dicendum quod non sunt simpliciter regule generales set ydoneitates et exempla ad regulas sumendas sufficienter per alia que alibi determinata sunt. Et hec regula ibi extrahenda est, E LITTERA FINITA, etc. (III.18; 522.27)

184. Consequenter ponit regulam de nominibus terminantibus in *o*, et ibi sic 85 extrahitur regula: si nomen terminatur in *o*, vel precedit vocalis vel consonans; si vocalis, vel *e*, ut *gaudeo*, vel *i*, ut *mulio*, et siue sic, siue sic, corripiunt penultimam in nominatiuo et producant ipsam in genitiuo et in aliis obliquis, ut *mulio mulionis*, etc.; si autem precedat consonans, producant penultimam in nominatiuo, ut *uligo*, *fuligo*, set in obliquis diuersificatur; aut enim retinent *o* quod fuit in recto, et tunc 90 producant penultimam in obliquis, ut *carbonis*, vel mutant *o*, et tunc corripiunt penultimam, ut *fuligo fuliginis*. Hanc regulam intendit cum dicit, O LITTERA TERMINATA, etc. (III.19; 522.29)

185. Consequenter de nominibus terminantibus in *i* dicit quod tantum unum nomen trisillabum inuenitur, scilicet *nichili*, quod in penultimo *i* breuiatur. Et hoc 95 est quod dicit, in I TERMINATUM, etc. (III.20; 523.2)

186. Si autem aliquis instet, dicens quod inmo, ut *mancipi*, dicendum quod instat in compositis, cum tamen auctor intendat de simplicibus. Si autem adhuc

66 *hyspana om. C* 67 antecedit] -det *C* *cretica* (*ceruca add. in marg. [al. man.]*) *C*  
 exceptis tamen] excipitur *V* 68 similibus] -lia *V* ante *a om. V* 69 aliam] aliquam *C*  
*r* et *n* (*recte c* et *n*)] *n* et *R* *V*; *R* et si *C* 70 regulam] -lis *V* que] autem *V* 71 seruandus]  
 conser- *C* loco] sequitur *C* 72 post rectis *spatium unius verbi in C* 78 *utensile*] utile *C*  
 81 ydoneitates] ydonee *V* 82 ibi] ita *C* 84 ibi *om. C* 85 regula si] ita quod *C*  
 86 *mulio*] *vermelio* (?) *C* 87 in<sup>1</sup> *om. V* *mulionis*] *nis V* 88 precedat] -dit *C*  
 producant] -cit *C* in nominatiuo *om. V* 89 set] si *C* post retinent *add. in obliquis*  
*V* quod] que *V* 90 producant penultimam] producitur penultima *C* *carbonis*] *strabo*  
*nis V* 90-91 corripiunt penultimam] corripiuntur *V* 94 nomen *om. V*

instet in hiis, *gummi*, *nauci*, *frugi*, et similibus, dicendum quod ars ista tota de regulis datur specialibus de trisyllabis principaliter et aliis polisyllabis et non de  
100 dissyllabis.

187. Consequenter determinat de dictionibus terminatis in *u*, dicens quod unum nomen trisillabum tantum reperitur terminatum in *u*, quod est monaptotum in singulari et in plurali declinabile, et istud corripitur in penultimo, scilicet *tonitru*. Et hoc est quod dicit, U LITTERA TERMINATUM, etc. (III.20; 523.3-4)

105 188. Consequenter ponit regulam de terminatis in *al* sillaba talem: si fiat consideratio qualis sit penultima in nominibus terminantibus in *al*, vel ergo in recto vel in obliquo; si recto, vel erit proprium nomen barbarum, et tunc corripit penultimam, ut *Hannibal*, *Hastrubal*, vel erit nomen appellativum, et tunc producit, ut *tribunal*, excepto hoc nomine *animal*; si in obliquo, vel ergo in neutro vel  
110 in masculino; si in neutro, producit in penultima, ut *animalis*, *tribunalis*; si in masculino, corripitur, ut *Hastrubalis*. Et hec regula ibi extrahenda est, AL SILLABA FINITA, etc. (III.20; 523.6)

189. Consequenter dicit de nominibus terminatis in *el* quod producant penultimam obliquorum si corripiunt penultimam rectorum, ut *Michael Michaelis*.  
115 Et hoc est quod dicit, EL SILLABA, etc. (add. III.20; 523.10)

190. Consequenter dicit de nominibus terminatis in *il* quod corripiunt penultimam tam in recto quam in obliquo, ut *euigil euigilis*. Et hoc est quod dicit, IL SILLABA TERMINATA, etc. (III.21; 523.10)

191. Consequenter dicit de nominibus terminatis in *ol* quod unum tale  
120 inuenitur quod corripitur in penultima, ut *Eliol*. Et hoc est quod dicit, OL SILLABA TERMINATA, etc. (III.21; 523.12)

192. Consequenter dicit de illis que terminantur in *ul* quod unum tale inuenitur quod est nomen proprium et barbarum, scilicet *Ernul*. Et hoc est quod dicit, UL SILLABA, etc. (III.21; 523.13)

125 193. Consequenter dicit de nominibus terminatis in *um* quod breuiantur in

113-114 haec verba in textu impresso non inueniuntur.

98 *nauci*] *mauci* C      99 *post* principaliter *add.* specialiter C      100 dissyllabis] aliis C  
101 determinat *om.* C      dictionibus *om.* C      dicens] dicit C      102 unum...u] tantum unum  
nomen terminatum in u inuenitur trisillabum C      monaptotum] -tatum V      103 in<sup>2</sup> *om.* V  
declinabile] determinabile V      istud] illud V      104 quod dicit *om.* C      105 sillaba] -bam  
C      107 in<sup>1</sup> *om.* V      si] siue C      tunc *om.* V      107-108 corripit penultimam] corripitur  
C      108 *Hastrubal*] -rab- C      108-109 producit] -citur C      109 ergo *om.* V      110 in<sup>2</sup>  
*om.* V      111 *Hastrubalis*] -rab- C      extrahenda] excercenda V      113 dicit] determinat C  
el] ol (?) C      114 si...rektorum *om.* C      115 quod dicit *om.* C      etc.] finita C  
116 il] illis V      117 ut *euigil in marg. (al. man.)* C      euigilis] lis V      quod dicit *om.* C  
120 ut *Eliol om.* C      quod dicit] et (*per modum lemmatis*) C      122 dicit *om.* V      illis] his  
V      terminantur] -nant V      *post* ul *add.* dicit V      123 scilicet *Ernul (recte Eriul)]* ut Michael  
C      125-126 in<sup>2</sup> penultima *om.* C

penultima, ut *Dorcium*, *Philorcium*. Et hoc est quod dicit, UM SILLABA, etc. (III.22; 523.14)

194. Et sciendum quod non ponit regulas iuxta nomina terminata in *am* vel *em*, vel in *im*, vel in *om*, quia non sunt nomina Latina huiusmodi de quibus, scilicet  
130 Latinis et trisyllabis, intendit ipse principaliter.

195. Consequenter ponit regulam de nominibus terminantibus in *en* talem: si nomen terminetur in *en* sillaba, vel preponitur *c* vel non; si sic, corripitur penultima, ut *fidicen*, *liricen*, et huiusmodi, set excipitur *tibicen*; si non habeant *c*  
C 27vb ante *en*, vel ergo deriuantur a prima coniugatione vel a quarta, / et tunc producunt  
135 penultimam, ut *solamen* a *solor* et *munimen* a *munio*; vel deriuantur a secunda vel tertia, et tunc corripiuntur in penultima, ut a *sedeo* dicitur *sedimen* et a *rego* *regimen*. Et hoc est quod dicit, EN SILLABA FINITA, etc. (III.22; 523.15)

196. Et sciendum quod non tangit de nominibus terminatis in *an*, vel in *in*, vel in *on* vel *un*, quia scilicet non sunt Latina huiusmodi trisyllaba.

140 197. Consequenter ponit regulam de hiis que terminantur in *ar*, dicens quod producuntur tam in rectis quam in obliquis, ut *torcular torcularis*. Set a rectis excipitur *laquear*, et ab obliquis *nectaris* et *iubaris*. Et hoc est quod dicit, AR SILLABA TERMINATA (III.23; 523.21).

198. Consequenter ponit regulam de nominibus terminatis in *er* sillaba talem:  
145 si nomen desinet in *er*, vel consideratur ad penultimam recti vel obliqui; si obliqui, breuiatur in penultima, ut *volucris*, *papaueris*, excipitur *mulieris*; si autem consideretur in recto, ergo vel erit neutri generis et producit penultimam, ut *papauer*, vel erit masculini generis vel feminini et corripit penultimam, ut *mulier*, *volucer*, exceptis hiis que positione producunt penultimam, ut *equester*, *silvester*. Et hoc est  
150 quod dicit, ER SILLABA, etc. (III.23; 523.25)

199. Consequenter determinat de hiis que terminantur in *ir*, et dicit quod breuiantur in penultima, ut *semiur*. Et hoc est quod dicit, IR SILLABA, etc. (III.24; 523.30)

200. Consequenter determinat de hiis que terminantur in *or*, et ponit talem  
155 regulam: si nomen desinat in *or*, vel est proprium vel appellatium; si proprium, V 108va penultima obliquorum corripitur, ut *Hector -ris*, *Nestor -ris*; si sit appellatium, /

126 quod dicit *om*. C 129 *em...om*] *im* vel in *em* C huiusmodi] hic C 131 *post*  
ponit *add*. ipse C terminantibus] -natis V 132 non] v V 133 non] vero V  
134 ante *en*] vel m V deriuantur] -uetur C a<sup>2</sup> *om*. V 135 deriuantur] -uatur C  
136 corripiuntur] -pitur C *sedeo*] *sedio* C 137 quod dicit *om*. C 138 tangit] -gitur  
V in<sup>1</sup> *om*. V 139 in *om*. V on] en C scilicet *om*. C 142 ab *om*. C quod  
dicit *om*. C 143 terminata] etc. V 144 *post* *er add*. c precedente ut in hac sillaba *er* eo  
precedente ut in hac C sillaba] sillaba *er* C: sillabam V 145 desinet] -nat V  
147 producit] -cet V 148 erit *om*. C masculini] -culi V feminini] -mini V  
150 quod dicit *om*. C 151 determinat *om*. C 152 *semiur*] *lemiur* (?) C quod  
dicit *om*. C 154 determinat *om*. C 154-155 *et...regulam*] dicit ponens regulam talem C  
156 penultima...corripitur] corripit penultimam obliquorum V

- vel ergo precedit *i* vocalis, et tunc corripit penultimam, ut *melior*, vel non habet *i* vocalem ante *or*; et si sic, vel est neutri generis, et tunc corripitur penultima in obliquis, ut *robor -boris* (quidam tamen libri dicunt quod excipitur *ebor -boris*)
- 160 quod producit penultimam vel est masculini generis vel feminini et producit penultima in obliquis, ut *amor -ris*, *ardor -ris*; set excipitur unum quod est omnis generis, scilicet *memor memoris* et eius compositum, ut *inmemor -ris*, in quibus corripitur penultima. Et hoc est quod dicit, OR SILLABA TERMINATA, etc. (III.24; 523.32)
- 165 201. Consequenter ponit regulam de nominibus terminantibus in *ur*, dicens quod corripiunt penultimam tam in recto quam in obliquo, ut *letifur -ris*. Et hoc est quod dicit, UR SILLABA TERMINATA, etc. (III.26; 524.5)
202. Consequenter ponit regulas de nominibus terminatis in *as*, dicens quod ipsa producuntur in penultimis obliquorum et corripiuntur in penultimis rectorum,
- 170 ut *dignitas dignitatis*, et in omni casu producunt *a* litteram. Set notandum quod quedam sunt propria per syncopam prolata que seruant accentum in ultima, ut *Arpinas* pro *Arpinatis* (sublata enim est hec sillaba *ti*) et semper super *a* seruatur accentus; et hec littera prius fuit in penultima, nunc autem est in ultima. Et hoc est quod dicit, AS SILLABA TERMINATA, etc. (III.26; 524.8)
- 175 203. Consequenter ponit regulam de hiis que terminantur in *es* talem: nomina desinentia in *es* vel sunt quinde declinationis vel tertie; si tertie, corripiunt penultimam tam in rectis quam in obliquis, ut *alipes alipedis*, excipiuntur *quietis*, *heredis*, *locupletis*, *mercedis*, et si que sunt similis formationis; si sint quinde declinationis, vel ergo habent vocalem ante *es*, et tunc corripiunt penultimam
- 180 nominatiui et producunt penultimam genitiui, ut *dies diei*; vel habent consonantem ante *es*, et corripiunt penultimam in obliquo, ut *fides fidei*. Et hoc est quod dicit, ES SILLABA TERMINATA, etc. (III.27; 524.14-15)
204. Consequenter ponit regulam de hiis que desinunt in *is* talem: nomina desinentia in *is* aut sunt dissillaba aut trisillaba; si dissillaba, corripiuntur in
- 185 obliquis, ut *iaspis iaspidis*, etc.; si sint trisillaba, vel ergo adiectiua vel substantiua;

159 *De acc.* III.26 (p. 524.6 et n. ad hanc lineam).

157 melior] mulier C 158 tunc om. V 159 robor -boris] robur -ris V libri om. C  
excipitur] est hic exceptum C -boris] -ris V 160 masculini] -culi V vel<sup>2</sup> feminini] aut  
-mini V 160-161 producit...obliquis] producit ultimam obliquorum V 161 ardor -ris om.  
C 162 memor memoris om. C ut...-ris] scilicet (*deinde spatium duorum verborum*) C  
163 quod dicit om. C 165 ponit regulam] dicit V ur] er C dicens om. V  
166 penultimam om. V letifur -ris] lucifer luciferis C 167 quod dicit om. C  
168 regulas] -lam V dicens] dico C 170 ut] vel C dignitatis] tis V notandum  
quod] rectificanda (?) habet C 171 sunt om. C syncopam] san- C 174 quod dicit om.  
C 178 locupletis] loca- C mercedis om. C 181 quod dicit om. C 182 terminata  
om. C 183 is] hiis C 184 corripiuntur] producuntur V 185 sint] sunt V

si substantiua, producant penultimam, ut *lebes -betis, sinapis*, etc.; si adiectiua, vel ergo habent consonantem inter *a* et *i* et producant penultimam tam recti quam obliqui, ut *memoralis, specialis*, etc.; vel non habent, ut *utilis, humilis*, et huiusmodi. Et de hiis non facit mentionem; quare videtur regula insufficiens: et hoc

190 verum est sumendo regulam proprie. Et hoc est quod dicit, IS SILLABA TERMINATA, etc. (III.28; 524.22-23)

205. Consequenter dicit de hiis que terminantur in *os* quod producantur in nominatiuis et in obliquo, ut *sacerdos -dotis*. Et hoc est quod dicit, OS SILLABA, etc. (III.29; 524.30-31)

195 206. Consequenter ponit regulam de hiis que terminantur in *us* talem: si nomina desinant in *us*, aut sunt propria aut communia; si propria, corripiunt penultimam, ut *Tullius*, nisi sint ibi positione longa, ut *Robertus* et huiusmodi; si sint communia, vel ergo sunt similia participiis descendencia a verbis — et hec sunt secunde declinationis vel quarte — vel sunt alia ab hiis; si sunt huiusmodi, in

200 penultima producantur, ut *armatus, cupidus*, etc. Set huic excipiuntur ista tria C 28ra composita, *illitus, insitus, nequitus*, / et composita ab hoc verbo *eo is*, ut *preteritus, obitus*, et composita ab hiis verbis *do* et *sto* et *reor*, ut *inditus, institus* et *irritus*.

Item, excipiuntur ea que veniunt ab hiis verbis *spiro* et *alo* et *ambio*, ut *spiritus, alitus, ambitus*, media correpta. Item, excipiuntur composita huius verbi *ruo* ut

205 *erutus, dirutus*. Et omnia ista possunt esse nomina vel participia secundum quod possunt habere tempus vel carere tempore. Si autem sint alia ab hiis, aut ergo sunt secunde declinationis aut tertie; si tertie, corripiunt penultimam in recto et producant ipsam in obliquo, ut *seruitus, seruitutis*, set excipiuntur que sunt positione longa in nominatiuo, ut *iuuentus*. Si autem sint secunde declinationis, aut

210 ergo sunt substantiua aut adiectiua; si substantiua, corripiunt penultimam, ut *fraxinus*, set excipitur *papirus*; si sint adiectiua, vel ergo sunt non habentia *c* inter *i* et *u* in loco penultimo vel habentia; si non, producantur penultima, ut *Martianus, capitanus*, etc. Et hec sequuntur eorum regulam que terminantur in *a*, habentia *n* ante *a*, de quibus dictum est superius [182]. Si autem habeant *c* inter *i* et *u* in

186 -betis] tis V      sinapis etc. om. V sed spatio duorum verborum relicto      188 memorialis]  
-ralis C      189 regula om. V      190 quod dicit om. C      192 in<sup>2</sup> om. C      193 quod dicit  
om. C      195 terminantur] -nant (?) V      196 desinant] terminantur C      197 ut Tullius om.  
C      sint] sit V      198 vel] aut C      198-199 hec...secunde] hoc est si secunde sunt C  
199 ab] ob C      199-200 in...producantur om. V      200 cupidus] -tus V      201 composita<sup>1</sup>  
om. C      illitus insitus] illicitus incitus V      preteritus] preditus C      202 obitus] ambitus V  
hiis verbis] hoc verbo V      inditus...irritus om. V sed spatio quatuor verborum relicto  
203 ab] a C      204 ruo] eruo C      205 post secundum add. hoc V      206 autem sint] aut  
sint V: sunt C      sunt om. V      207 aut] vel V      208 ipsam om. C      seruitutis] tis V  
set om. V      209 sint] sit V      209-210 aut...sunt om. V      210 aut] vel V      211 set om.  
V      sint] sunt V      sunt om. V      212 u] n V      213-214 habentia...a om. C      214 post  
autem add. non C      i] a V

215 penultimo loco, corripuntur in penultima, ut *Gallicus, Anglicus, Scoticus*; et addit illis unum quod est quarte declinationis substantium, scilicet *porticus*. Et hec diuisio ibi extrahenda est, US SILLABA FINITA, etc. (III.29; 525.2)

207. Consequenter ponit regulam de nominibus terminantibus in *ax* talem: omne nomen desinens in *ax* corripit penultimam recti et producit penultimam obliquorum, ut *pertinax pertinacis*. Et hoc est quod dicit, AX SILLABA TERMINATA, etc. (III.33; 525.30)

208. Consequenter ponit regulam de hiis que terminantur in *ex* talem: si nomen terminetur in *ex*, corripit penultimam tam recti quam obliqui, ut *artifex artificis*, excipitur tamen *veruex veruecis*, quod producit penultimam genitiui et obliquorum aliorum. Et hoc est quod dicit, EX SILLABA TERMINATA (III.33; 525.32).

209. Consequenter ponit regulam de hiis que terminantur in *ix* talem: si nomen terminetur in *ix*, producit penultimam tam in recto quam in obliquo, ut *bellatrix bellatricis*; set a recto excipiuntur *meretrix* et *genitrix*, ab obliquo, *salicis, calicis, silicis*. Et hoc est quod dicit, IX SILLABA FINITA (III.34; 525.34-35).

210. Consequenter ponit regulam de hiis que terminantur in *ox*, sic: omne nomen desinens in *ox* (et intellige, trisillabum adminus) corripit penultimam in nominatiuo et producit in obliquo, ut *veliuox veliuocis*. Et hoc est quod dicit, OX SILLABA TERMINATA, etc. (III.34; 526.2)

211. Consequenter ponit regulam de hiis que terminantur in *ux*, dicens quod producant penultimam obliquorum, ut *Pollux Pollucis*, set excipitur *coniux coniugis*. Et hoc est quod dicit, UX SILLABA TERMINATA, etc. (III.34; 526.4)

212. Consequenter ponit regulam de nominibus terminantibus in *t* littera, dicens quod illa omnia tam in recto quam in obliquo corripunt penultimam, ut *sinciput sincipitis*. Et hoc est quod dicit, T LITTERA TERMINATA, etc. (III.35; 526.7)

213. Consequenter ponit regulam de nominibus in duas consonantes terminantibus talem: si consideretur penultima nominum desinentium in duas consonantes, aut ergo in recto aut in obliquo; si in recto, vel habebunt penultimam positione longam, ut *irascens*, et tunc patet accentus; vel non habebunt ipsam positione productam, et si sic, erunt composita, ut in pluribus si sint trisillaba vel amplius,

et tunc aut / producta sunt in simplicitate in penultimis sillabis vel non; si sic, V 108vb

215 corripuntur] -pitur V    Scoticus om. V    218 ax] ar C    219 desinens] terminans V  
 220 obliquorum] -qui V    quod dicit om. C    222 ex talem] ex (corr. ex ax) sic V  
 224 artificis] cis V    genitiui] -uo C    225 ex] et C    terminata] etc. V    226 talem]  
 sic V    228 bellatrix] bol- C    recto corr. ex nominatiuo C: nominatiuo V    excipiuntur]  
 -pitur C    229 silicis] phisicis V    quod dicit om. C    231 et...trisillabum] in trisillabis V  
 232 veliuocis] cis V    234 dicens om. V    235-236 Pollucis...coniugis] cis V  
 236 quod dicit om. C    terminata etc. om. C    237 nominibus om. C    238 omnia] nomina C  
 239 sinciput sincipitis] cinciput tis V    quod dicit om. C    241 si...desinentium om.  
 V sed spatium quinque verborum relicto    242 vel] aut ergo C    244 si² sint om. V    245 tunc]  
 duo V

producent penultimam similiter in compositione, ut *clamans conclamans*; si non, semper corripiunt penultimam, ut *armipotens* et huiusmodi; si autem consideretur penultima in obliquis, vel ergo seruant positionem in penultima et producent ipsam, ut *omnipotens*, vel non seruant positionem, ut *inopis*, *hyemis*, *celibis*, *adipis*.

250 Et hoc est quod dicit, QUE IN DUAS CONSONANTES DESINUNT (III.35; 526.10).

214. Et sic terminatur pars de specialibus regulis accentuandi nomina. Regule vero quas sic in diuisione reduximus, modo confuso ab auctore traduntur, cuius modus dicendi ipsas si plus ametur quam modus quem diximus, manifestus est intuenti litteram.

255 215. Circa hoc capitulum in generali contingit dubitare; videtur enim quod non possit tradere artem talem accentuandi nomina sufficienter hac ratione: nomina sunt infinita apud nos; ex infinitis autem non est ars neque scientia; ergo ex nominibus accentuandis non erit ars neque scientia ita, scilicet, quod sufficiens.

216. Item, scientia est ex hiis que impossibile est alio modo se habere; nomina 260 accentuanda siue sub modo accentuandi possunt alio modo se habere: ergo, etc. Probatio minoris: apud diuersos diuerse sunt nominum inpositiones et eorundem prolationes; et ideo diuersus modus accentuandi erit apud diuersos; et sic sequitur idem quod prius.

C 28rb 217. Ad primum [215] dicendum est quod dupliciter contingit / cognoscere 265 aliquid; unde, cum per scientiam vel artem fiat rei cognitio, dupliciter de aliquo potest esse scientia vel ars. Contingit enim ignoscere in speciali, scire tamen sub ratione uniuersali; sicut dicit Aristotiles in *Posterioribus*, contingit scire quoniam omnis triangulus in communi habet tres, non tamen in speciali, cum speciales trianguli sint numero infiniti. Similiter in proposito: licet nomina secundum 270 numerum sunt infinita quoad nos, et ita non sunt scita, tamen sciuntur sub ratione generali, et ita de ipsis potest esse scientia et ars et est in veritate. Et quod hec scientia sit de nominibus, set sub uniuersali collectione et non de particularibus omnibus secundum quod huiusmodi, planum est per regulas generales accentuandi quas posuit superius. Dantur enim regule in monosyllabis et trisyllabis et polisyllabis

267-269 Arist., *APo.* 1.24 (85b38-86a8).

246 producent] -cant V similiter] simpliciter C 247 armipotens] omni- C conside-  
retur] -ratur V 248 ergo om. V in penultima om. V 249 post omnipotens add. tis  
etc. V celibis] calipis C 250 quod dicit om. C que] quod V 252 vero] autem V  
traduntur] -ducitur V cuius] tercius C 253 ipsas] ipsa V ametur] continetur C  
manifestus] -tum C 255 circa...dubitare] sic contingit dubitare circa hoc capitulum V enim  
om. V 256 accentuandi] ad accentuandum V 257 infinita] -to V autem om. V  
non] neque C 258 scilicet om. V sufficiens] -ciencia V 259 alio] aliquo V  
262 ideo] ita V 265 unde] unum C 266-267 tamen...uniuersali] autem in omni ratione  
bene C 268 omnis om. C 269 licet] neque C 270 quoad] apud C 272 set] scilicet  
C



275 de modis accentuandi generales, inspiciendo ad aliquem locum determinatum  
 ipsius accentus et non in singulis nominibus in speciali. Item, speciales regule  
 dantur de nominibus sic vel sic terminatis, comprehendendo multa sub una regula,  
 et ita in generali traditur hec ars de nominibus.

218. Ad secundum [216] dicendum quod iste regule considerari possunt  
 280 secundum quod sunt nominum sic vel sic terminantium in voce et secundum quod  
 hee voces apud diuersos diuersificantur, et sic contingit ea aliter se habere apud  
 diuersos, et sic non est de ipsis scientia. Possunt autem aliter considerari secundum  
 quod regule primo date secundum terminationes dictionum reducuntur ad unam  
 artem et scientiam perficiendam, et sic impossibile est ea aliter se habere. Regule  
 285 enim secundum sui reductionem in unam artem constituendam apud omnes eedem  
 sunt, licet terminationes in quibus fundantur regule sunt diuerse. In omni enim  
 ydiomate secundum gramaticam traduntur huiusmodi regule penes terminationes,  
 cum gramatica sit ars recte scribendi et recte loquendi et recte pronuntiandi, et  
 collectionem istarum regularum ad artis unius constitutionem impossibile est aliter  
 290 se habere, et sic de nominibus accentuandis contingit esse artem et scientiam. Et  
 sciendum, licet contingat regulas aliter se habere usu vel differentie causa, hoc non  
 est secundum artem, et sic obiectum non teneret.

219. Set tunc questio fit: si hec ars et iste regule sumantur iuxta nomen in  
 generali; cum dixit omne nomen desinens in *a* vel in *e*, etc., hec est uniuersalis,  
 295 et omnis uniuersalis habet cognosci per inductionem, ergo hec habet cognosci per  
 inductionem; set inductio fit per singularia, ergo ad cognitionem uniuersalis  
 exigitur cognitio singularium si per inductionem cognoscatur; ergo si non contingit  
 cognoscere ipsa singularia, cum sint infinita, nec ipsum uniuersale cognoscere  
 continget.

300 220. Ad quod [219] dicendum quod huiusmodi uniuersalia, omne nomen  
 desinens in *a*, et similia habent cognosci per inductionem; inductio autem fit per  
 similia, ut habetur in *Topicis*, et propositio per inductionem sumitur penes  
 similitudinem singularium; unde si aliqua sint singularia vere et similia in quibus

288 cf. Dom. Gundiss., *De diuisione philosophiae*, ed. L. Bauer (BGPM 4.2-3; Münster, 1903),  
 p. 44.17-18 et Kilwardby, *In Donati Artem maiorem III*, p. 5.18-20. 294 *De acc.* III.14-18  
 (pp. 521.34-522.19) et vide supra, §§ 182-183. 301-302 cf. Arist., *Top.* 1.8 (108b10-12).

276 in singulis] de (*deinde spatium duorum verborum*) *V* post item add. quod *V* 277 de  
 nominibus om. *V* multa] multas *V* 280 terminantium] -natorum *V* 282 autem] tamen  
*V* post aliter add. se habere et considerari possunt aut aliter se habere et *C* secundum]  
 possunt secundum *C*: scilicet *V* 283 primo om. *V* terminationes] reducciones *C*  
 288 recte<sup>2</sup> om. *V* recte<sup>3</sup> pronuntiandi] intelligendi *V* 291 licet contingat] hoc contingit *C*  
 292 post sic add. patet *C* 293 questio fit] queritur *V* iste om. *C* 295 et] cum *C*  
 habet] stat *C* 295-296 ergo...inductionem om. *C* 300 quod<sup>1</sup>] hoc *V* uniuers-  
 alia] verba *C* 301 fit] habet *C* 302 similia] singularia *C* post ut add. secundo *C*  
 303 sint] sunt *V* vere] vera *V*

inducitur, non oportet enumerare omnia singularia, set per similitudinem enumera-  
 305 torum sumere non numerata: unde sciendum quod apud diuersos diuersus est usus  
 in speciali penes diuersitatem ydiomatum, non tamen in generali est usus diuersus  
 secundum quod talis regula et talis ad artem reducuntur.

221. Consequenter contingit hic querere: cum intendit hic ponere regulas  
 cognoscendi accentum, ad quid ponit regulas cognoscendi tempus cum accentus  
 310 et tempus sint accidentia opposita ipsius sillabe.

222. Item, ex quo sillabe accidunt tria, scilicet tempus, spiritus et accentus,  
 quare magis dat regulas cognoscendi tempus quam cognoscendi spiritum.

223. Item, queritur quare magis diuersificatur cognitio ipsius accentus penes  
 diuersitatem cognoscendi tempus quam penes diuersitatem cognoscendi spiritum.

315 224. Item, queritur: cum ars metrica sit de tempore sicut ars accentuandi de  
 accentu, si illa que est ars metrica nichil determinat de accentu, nec de regulis  
 accentuandi, quare videtur quod nec econuerso debeat illa que est de accentu  
 determinare de regulis cognoscendi tempus.

225. Ad primum [221] dicendum quod, quia cognitio et diuersitas ipsius  
 320 accentus dependet a cognitione et a diuersitate ipsius temporis, ideo ad hoc quod  
 cognoscitur accentus oportet cognoscere tempus, et hac ratione determinat hic de  
 regulis diuersificationem temporum manifestantibus. Et quod cognitio accentus  
 dependet a cognitione temporis sic ostendendum est: cognito quod dictio mono-  
 sillaba sit naturaliter producta, cognoscitur quod debet circumflecti; si non sit longa  
 325 natura, debet acui; eodem modo in aliis regulis de dictionibus dissillabis et  
 polisillabis; et sic patet quod cognito tempore, cognoscitur quis debet esse eius  
 accentus, et ita cognitio accentus dependet a cognitione temporis. Non autem est  
 sic econuerso, quia nec diuersitas temporis, nec cognitio eius, dependet a cogni-  
 tione accentus, quia tempus est dispositio materialis ad accentum sicut longitudo  
 C 28va 330 ad latitudinem; et propterea non oportet scientiam que est de tempore / deter-  
 V 109ra minare de regulis / cognoscendi accentum sicut econuerso. Ad hoc autem quod  
 dicit [221], sunt accidentia opposita tempus et accentus, dicendum quod non  
 confert unum ad alterum in eo quod ei opponitur set in eo quod unius cognitio non  
 habetur perfecte sine cognitione alterius. Per iam dicta patet responsio ad primum  
 335 [221] et ad ultimum [224].

307 secundum] ibi C    308 contingit...querere] queritur V    314 penes diuersitatem? om.  
 C    316 si] set C    ars om. V    nichil] non V    317 nec om. C    320 a<sup>2</sup> om. C  
 ipsius om. V    322 diuersificationem] -sitatem V    manifestantibus] nominibus C    323 post  
 temporis *canc.* manifestum est V    sic...cognito] patet C    324 naturaliter] natura V  
 cognoscitur] conuenit C    non] namque C    325 natura] ista V    326 eius om. C  
 328 eius om. V    329 tempus est] est quasi C    materialis] naturalis C    330 latitudinem]  
 alti- C    post non *add.* quod C    332 post accidentia opposita *spatio unius verbi relicto add.*  
 natura opposita C    dicendum quod] ergo V    333 opponitur] est oppositum V  
 334 habetur perfecte] perfecto haberetur C

226. Ad reliqua [222-223] dicendum quod non determinat de regulis diuersificandi spiritum, quia non confert ad completam cognitionem accentus; nullus enim accentus determinat sibi spiritum asperum vel lenem sicut tempus longum et breue. Circumflexus enim semper determinat sibi tempus productum; similiter, 340 acutus accentus in trisyllabis vel polisyllabis, si cadat supra penultimam, determinat sibi tempus productum. Sic autem non est de spiritu: siue enim sillaba habeat spiritum asperum vel lenem, contingit fieri in ipsa quemcumque accentum secundum exigentiam regularum. Sic igitur patet quod omnis accentus potest esse sub omni differentia spiritus set non sub omni differentia temporis: et propterea 345 determinat de regulis diuersificandi tempus et non de hiis que docent diuersificare spiritum.

227. Et inde patet responsio ad tertium [223], scilicet quod quia omnis accentus potest esse sub omni differentia spiritus et non sub omni differentia temporis, ideo diuersificatur accentus magis penes tempus quam penes spiritum.

350 228. Consequenter queritur specialius hoc modo: ita est quod omnes hee regule quas ponit sunt ad cognoscendum tempus penultimarum in trisyllabis et polisyllabis aliis, queritur tunc quare non ponit regulas cognoscendi tempus in monosyllabis et dissyllabis sicut in ceteris polisyllabis.

229. Ad hoc [228] dicendum quod, quamuis sit necessaria cognitio temporis 355 in hiis, tamen non accidit error tam manifestus circa accentum in monosyllabis et dissyllabis sicut in trisyllabis et deinceps; in monosyllabis enim et dissyllabis semper est unus locus accentus determinatus nisi fuerit causa impediens; in trisyllabis autem et deinceps non sic, quia ibi possunt principales accentus diuersa loca optinere. Item, quia accentus acutus et circumflexus non multum differre videntur in 360 pronuntiando, si ponatur unus pro altero non incidit ob hoc error manifestus in monosyllabis et dissyllabis. In aliis autem polisyllabis aliter est; in illis enim est duplex locus accentus principalis, scilicet antepenultimus et penultimus; unde cum unus habeat accentum principalem, reliquus autem accentum non principalem: unde, si sillaba habens accentum principalem proferatur sub non principali et 365 econuerso, accidit error manifestus, quia multum differunt in pronuntiando principalis accentus et non principalis. Et hac ratione non ponit regulas speciales cognoscendi tempus in monosyllabis et dissyllabis sicut in ceteris polisyllabis.

336 reliqua] -quum C      337 spiritum] speciem C      nullus] non V      338 accentus  
determinat] determinant V      sibi] vel C      vel] et V      et] vel V      341 sic] similiter V  
342 ipsa] prima C      344 set...temporis om. C      344-345 propterea determinat] prima -natur  
C      345 tempus] spiritus C      diuersificare] -sitatem V      347 inde] quantum ad hoc C  
351 regule om. V      tempus om. C      355 non om. C      356 enim om. V      357 determi-  
natus] diuersificatus C      impediens] inpositionis V      autem] vero V      359 accentus om. V  
363 habeat] habet V      366 post<sup>et</sup> add. in C      non<sup>2</sup> om. V      367 cognoscendi tempus om.  
V      ceteris om. V

230. Consequenter queritur circa ultimam partem huius capituli hoc modo:  
quia multo plura nomina desinunt in semiuocales quam in mutas, ideo multas ponit  
370 regulas de hiis que terminantur in semiuocales et non de hiis que terminantur in  
mutas; set tunc queritur quare magis determinantur nomina per semiuocales quam  
per mutas. Solum enim ponit unam regulam de hiis que in mutas terminantur, sicut  
de hiis que terminantur in *c*.

231. Item, in mutas desinunt aliqua nomina, sicut in *c*, ut *allec*, et in *t*, ut  
375 *caput*, et non in alias: quare est hoc quod magis desinunt nomina in *t* et *c* quam  
in alias mutas.

232. Item, cum nomina desinant in *c*, et *k* et *q* et *c* idem elementum  
representant secundum Priscianum, queritur quare non terminantur nomina in *k*  
et in *q* sicut in *c*.

233. Item, cum nominum desinentium in mutas quedam desinunt in *t* et  
380 quedam in *c*, queritur quare non determinet regulam de hiis que desinunt in *c* sicut  
de hiis que desinunt in *t*.

234. Ad primum [230] dicendum quod inter omnes litteras mute minimum  
habent de sono, et propterea dicuntur *mute* quia minimum habent sonum; set  
385 vocales primam habent eufoniam et magis de sono, semiuocales vero secundam,  
mute vero ultimam: et propterea, quia minus habent de sono, finis autem dictionis  
redundat in sono, ideo minus ponuntur nomina terminantia in mutas quam in alias  
litteras.

235. Ad secundum [231] dicendum est quod inter omnes mutas generatio  
390 istarum, *t* et *c*, magis accedit ad generationem vocalium et semiuocalium quia  
interius generantur quam alie; unde plus habent de sono et eufonia quam alie mute:  
C 28vb et propterea magis possunt terminare dictionem quam / alie mute.

236. Ad tertium [232] dicendum quod, licet ista tria sint idem elementum  
eandem substantiam habentia, habent tamen sonum accidentaliter diuersificatum;  
395 *c* enim magis terminatum habet sonum et minus fluxibilem quam *k* et *q*, sicut patet  
per motum instrumentorum in generatione ipsorum: et propterea magis termi-  
nantur dictiones in *c* quam in *k* et *q*.

377-378 Prisc., *Inst. gramm.* 1.14 (GL 2.12:5-7). 383-385 cf. *ibid.* 1.10 (GL 2.9:28-29).

369 quia *om. C* ponit] posuit *V* 370 in<sup>1</sup>...terminantur<sup>2</sup> in *marg. (al. man.) C*  
semiuocales] -libus *V* 371 mutas] mutis *V* 372 mutas<sup>2</sup>] muta *CV* 374 in *c* *corr.*  
ex hic *C* ut<sup>2</sup>] sicut *V* 375 alias] illas *C* est...quod *om. V* et<sup>2</sup>] vel *V* 379 in<sup>1</sup>  
*om. C* 380 desinunt] -nant *C* 381 determinet] -nat *V* 381-382 sicut...t *om. C*  
384 minimum] mutum *V* 387 ponuntur] inpo- *C* 388 litteras *om. C* 390 istarum *t*  
et *c*] harum *p c t V* 391 post generantur *add. plus C* 391-392 unde...alie<sup>2</sup> *om. C et add.*  
in *marg. (perperam post 390 quia)* 393 sint] sunt *C* 394 eandem...habentia] substantialiter  
*V* 397 dictiones *om. V* in<sup>2</sup> *om. C*

237. Ad ultimum [233] dicendum quod nomina terminantia in *c* aut sunt monosyllaba, ut *lac*, vel dissyllaba quorum penultime producuntur positione, ut  
 400 *allec*; et de hiis per se patet modus accentuandi per generales regulas superius datas: et propterea non ponit regulam de nominibus terminatis in *c* sicut de hiis que terminantur in *t*.

## &lt;LECTIO 6&gt;

238. REGULIS ACCENTUUM, etc. (iv.36; 526.16) Postquam determinauit auctor de regulis accentuandi nomina, in hac parte determinat de regulis accentuandi verba. Et diuiditur hec pars in quatuor: in quarum prima determinat de regulis  
 5 accentuandi verba prime coniugationis, in secunda verba secunde coniugationis, in tertia verba tertie, in quarta verba quarte; secunda pars incipit cum dicit, OMNIA VERBA SECUNDE CONIUGATIONIS (iv.40; 527.10); tertia, ubi dicit, VERBA TERTIE CONIUGATIONIS (v.41; 527.18); quarta, cum dicit, QUARTE CONIUGATIONIS VERBA, etc. (vi.44; 528.3)

10 239. Consequenter determinando modum accentuandi participia dicit quod similis est modus seruandus in nominibus et participiis, et illa pars indiuisa est et incipit ibi, PARTICIPIUM NAMQUE, etc. (vii.45; 528.14)

240. Consequenter determinat modum accentuandi pronomina ubi dicit, PRONOMINA VERO SIMILITER (vii.46; 528.46). Et diuiditur illa pars in duas: in quarum  
 15 prima determinat de pronominibus seruantibus accentum super locum non debitum; in secunda, de hiis que seruant accentum super locum debitum cum dicit, ET NON SOLUM ERANT, etc. (vii.46; 528.20-21)

241. Prima istarum diuiditur in duas: in quarum prima determinat que pronomina seruant accentum in loco non debito sicuti in ultimo; in secunda  
 20 causam huius subiungit cum dicit, IDEO HEC APUD MODERNOS, etc. (vii.46; 528.18)

242. ADVERBIA QUE E TERMINANTUR, etc. (vii.47; 528.23-24) Postquam determinauit modum accentuandi in partibus declinabilibus, hic incipit determinare de

400-401 *De acc.* ii.10-11, 12 (p. 521.5-10, 13-16) et vide supra, §§ 138-139.

398 terminantia] -nata *V* 399 ut<sup>1.2</sup>] sicut *V* penultime *add. in marg. C et expunx. in textu*  
 quod non littere

Lectio 6 2 determinauit] -nat *V* auctor *om. C* 5-6 secunde...verba<sup>1</sup> *om. C*  
 6 verba<sup>2</sup> *om. C* 11 similis...seruandus] similis (*corr. ex sumitur*) modus conseruandus est *C*  
 12 ibi] cui (*per modum lemmatis*) *C* 14 similiter *om. C* 15, 16 super] supra *V*  
 18 que] cuiusmodi *V* 19 seruant] grauant *C* sicuti] sicut *C* post ultimo *expunx.* scilicet  
*V* 20 hec *om. C* modernos etc.] etc. (*deinde spatium*) *C* 21 e *om. C* 21-22 de-  
 terminauit] docuit *C*

indeclinabilibus. Et diuiditur hec pars in quatuor partes: in quarum prima determinat modum accentuandi aduerbia; in secunda, cum dicit, HANC AUTEM REGULAM, etc. (VII.48; 528.32), determinat modum accentuandi coniunctiones; in tertia, cum dicit, PREPOSITIO VERO IN FINE, etc. (VII.48; 528.33-34), determinat modum accentuandi prepositiones; in quarta, cum dicit, INTERIECTIO VERO, etc. (VII.48; 528.34), determinat modum accentuandi interiectiones. Omnes hee partes indiuisse sunt preter primam, que diuiditur in duas: in quarum prima determinat modum accentuandi aduerbia simplicia secundum diuersas eius terminationes; in secunda, cum dicit, NOTANDUM NAMQUE, etc. (VII.48; 528.30), determinat modum accentuandi aduerbia composita ex aduerbiis et prepositionibus.

243. In speciali sic procedit. Primo ponit regulam de verbis prime coniugationis que, quia confuse et inordinate in littera consecuta est, sic extrahitur diuidendo: omne verbum prime coniugationis vel est simplex vel compositum; si simplex / et intelligatur de trisyllabis, polisyllabis, vel ergo est presentis temporis vel preteriti vel futuri; si presentis, vel ergo indicatiui modi vel imperatiui vel coniunctiui vel optatiui vel infinitiui; si autem sit presentis temporis indicatiui vel imperatiui vel coniunctiui, vel ergo est singularis numeri vel pluralis; si singularis sit, penultimam corripit, ut *rogito rogita rogitem*, exceptis hiis que positione producuntur in penultima, ut *magistro magistras*; si pluralis, producit penultimam preter quam in tertia persona, ut *rogitent et rogitant*. Si autem sit presentis optatiui vel infinitiui, producit generaliter penultimam, ut *rogitare rogitare*, etc. Si autem sit temporis preteriti, vel ergo preteriti imperfecti vel alterius; si imperfecti, aut indicatiui aut subiunctiui; si indicatiui, producit penultimam, ut *rogitabam*; si subiunctiui modi, producit penultimam sicut presens optatiui. Si autem sit alterius preteriti quam imperfecti, vel ergo preteriti perfecti vel preteriti plusquamperfecti; si preteriti perfecti, vel ergo indicatiui modi vel subiunctiui; si indicatiui, vel ergo desinit in *au*, ut *amaui*, vel in *vi* diuisas, ut *plicui*, *micui*; quod si in *au*, producit penultimam in omni persona preter quam in prima persona pluralis numeri; / si vero desinit in *vi* diuisas, corripit penultimam in singulari, ut *plicuit*, excepta secunda persona que positione producitur, ut *plicuisti*; in plurali autem producit penultimam preter quam in prima persona, ut *plicuimus*, *plicuistis*, *plicuerunt* vel *plicuere*. Si sit preteritum perfectum modi subiunctiui, corripit penultimam in omni persona, ut

23 partes om. V 31 notandum] nota C determinat corr. in marg. ex et extra C  
 33-34 post coniugationis add. per modum lemmatis (fort. perperam pro expunctione) quam confuse C 34 quia om. C inordinate corr. ex immediate C 38 presentis temporis] presens V 39 sit om. V 40 rogita rogitem] ta tem V 40-41 producuntur in penultima] producant penultimam V 41 magistras] tras V 42 rogitant] -tantur C sit] sicut C presentis] presens V 43 producit] -cunt C sit] sint C 44 ergo om. V 45 subiunctiui<sup>1</sup>] con-V producit] -cunt C rogitabam] rogabam -bas etc. V modi om. C 46 sicut] ut C 47 preteriti<sup>2,3</sup> om. C 48 modi om. C 49 micui quod om. V 50 prima om. V pluralis numeri] plurali V vero] autem V 51 in singulari om. V plicuit] plicui V

- 55 *amauerim -ris*, etc. Si vero sit preteritum plusquamperfectum, vel ergo modi indicatiui vel optatiui vel subiunctiui vel infinitiui; si indicatiui, vel ergo numeri singularis vel pluralis; si singularis, corripit penultimam in omni persona, ut *amaueram*, etc.; si sit pluralis, penultimam producit, excepta tertia persona que corripit penultimam, ut *amauerant*. Si autem sit preteritum plusquamperfectum
- 60 optatiui vel subiunctiui vel infinitiui, producit penultimam positione, ut *amauissem*. Si autem verbum simplex prime coniugationis sit futuri temporis, vel ergo indicatiui modi vel imperatiui vel optatiui vel subiunctiui; si indicatiui, in singulari producit penultimam in omni persona, ut *amabo*; si sit in plurali corripit penultimam, ut *amabimus*, ita excepta tertia persona, ut *amabunt*; si vero sit futurum imperatiui,
- 65 producit penultimam in omni persona, tam in singulari quam in plurali; si vero sit futurum optatiui, similem habet accentum cum presenti modi coniunctiui et presenti modi indicatiui; si vero sit futurum modi subiunctiui, similem habebit accentum cum preterito perfecto subiunctiui, corripiendo penultimam. Si autem sit verbum prime coniugationis et compositum, seruat eundem accentum supra
- 70 penultimam in compositione quam in simplicitate supra eandem sillabam. Hec regula extrahenda est ab illa littera, *REGULIS ACCENTUUM*, etc. (iv.36; 526.16)

244. In fine autem huius regule cum dicit, *EXCIPITUR RELAUO*, QUOD IN PRETERITO, etc. (iv.38; 527.3), facit quandam notabilitatem, et non proprie exceptionem, quod quedam sunt verba prime coniugationis, ut *relauo*, *reuiuo*, que in preterito
- 75 perfecto et plusquamperfecto indicatiui modi et futuro coniunctiui seruant accentum supra unam sillabam, et in aliis temporibus non fit supra eandem sillabam set diuersam, ut *relaui*, *relaueram*, *relauero*. Ista seruant accentum supra hanc sillabam *la*; set si dicam, *relauabam*, *relauauero*, hec seruant accentum supra hanc sillabam *ua*, et ita non supra eandem quam prius est; similiter est de hoc verbo *reuiuo*. In
- 80 reliquis vero omnibus ita est quod supra eandem sillabam in omni tempore seruant accentum, ut *amabam*, *amaui*, *amaueram*, *amarem*, *amauerim*; omnia ista in hac sillaba *ma* seruant accentum. Et sciendum quod hanc eandem notabilitatem ponit in verbis secunde coniugationis et tertie et quarte.

55 vero *om. C* modi *om. V* 56 ergo *om. V* 57 singularis<sup>1-2</sup>] -re *C* 58 sit *om. V* 59 si] sin *V* 60 vel<sup>1</sup> *om. C* amauissem] amarem amauisse *V* 63 ut<sup>1</sup>...sit *om. V* 63-64 corripit...ita] vero corripitur in omni *V* 64 persona *om. V* 64, 66 futurum] -ri *C* 67 modi<sup>2</sup> *om. V* habebit] habet *V* 68-70 si...penultimam *om. C* 70 post compositione expunx. scilicet *V* quam] et *C* 70-71 hec...extrahenda] hanc regulam extrahendam *V* 71 ab] ob *C* regulis] -la *C* 72 relauo] relacio (?) *C* 73 notabilitatem...proprie] nobilitatem...proprie *C*: uocabilitatem inproprie *V* 74 relauo reuiuo] relauo reuelo *V*: relacio (?) et euiuo *C* 75 modi *om. V* futuro] -ri *C* 76 unam] ultimam *C* fit supra] super *V* 77 relaueram relauero] relaui *V* hanc *om. C* 78 relauauero hec] rem hic *V* 79 va] ba va *V* 81 amaui...amauerim] vi ram rem bo *V* 82 notabilitatem ponit] nobilitatem ponit *C*: vocalitatem facit *V*

245. Ultimo autem in hac prima coniugatione dat hanc regulam: cum quacum-  
85 que parte orationis componitur prepositio, quale tempus habuerit extra composi-  
tionem, tale habebit in compositione, ut *redimo*, *inhereo*, et similia. Et hoc dicit  
ibi, PREPOSITIO ETIAM CUM COMPONITUR (IV.39; 527.7-8).

246. Consequenter exsequitur de regulis accentuandi verba aliarum coniuga-  
tionum, in quibus, sicut iam patet in prima coniugatione, faciliter per diuisionem  
90 potest perpendi quid intendit: et propterea ad verba aliarum coniugationum  
accentuanda sufficiant ea que diximus [243-244].

247. Consequenter de pronomibus procedit hoc modo, dicens quod pro-  
nomina seruant eandem regulam accentuandi quam et nomina, quia aut seruant  
accentum in ultima, et tunc in loco debito, vel alibi, et tunc in loco debito;  
95 in ultima, ut *nostras*, *vestras*. Et huius rationem assignat, dicens quod antiqui  
solebant dicere, *nostratis*, *vestratis*, in nominatio seruant accentum supra hanc  
litteram *a*; nos autem dicimus, *nostras*, *vestras*, supra eandem sillabam seruantes  
accentum: unde, cum sint illa loca apud nos in ultima sillaba, seruamus accentum  
supra ultimam. Et hoc est quod dicit, PRONOMINA VERO SIMILITER (VII.46; 528.16).

248. Consequenter dicit de hiis que in loco debito seruant accentum quod  
antiqui non solum habuerunt huiusmodi finales adictiones cuiusmodi est *tis* set  
etiam alias que apponuntur solum usu vel causa discretionis, ut *met*, *ne*, *ce*, et  
huiusmodi; dicitur enim *egomet*, hoc est ego et non aliis, et ita fit discretio per  
sillabicam adictionem; similiter, *illicine*, *isticine* et huiusmodi. Et hoc est quod  
105 dicit, ET NON SOLUM HEC ERANT, etc. (VII.46; 528.20-21)

249. Consequenter de regulis accentuandi aduerbia dicit quod aduerbia termi-  
nata in *e*, non descendunt a propriis nominibus, corripiunt penultimam, ut  
*sedule*; venientia vero a propriis producuntur, ut *Tulliane*, idest modo Tullii. Item,  
si desinant in *m*, producunt penultimam, ut *tuatim*. Et hoc est quod dicit, ADUERBIA  
110 QUE E, etc. (VII.47; 528.23)

88-89 *De acc.* IV.40-VI.44 (pp. 527.10-528.12).

84 post coniugatione dat spatio duorum vel trium verborum relicto add. dicit V 85 componi-  
tur] -natur V 86 inhereo] inhabeo C similia] sillaba C 87 etiam] et C 88 exsequi-  
tur de regulis] sequitur de regulis C: exemplificat regulas V 90 quid intendit] intenditur C  
92 pronomibus...modo] pronomine prosequitur V 93 seruant<sup>2</sup>] grauant C 94 tunc<sup>2</sup> in<sup>3</sup>  
om. V 95 in ultima] ultimo C 96 solebant dicere] dicebant V nostratis vestratis] mans  
mantis (?) C 97 litteram] sillabam V vestras om. C supra] super V sillabam]  
litteram V 98 sint...sillaba] illa sillaba sit in ultima apud nos C 99 supra om. C  
similiter] etc. V 100 post accentum add. dicens V 101 tis] ti V: n C 102 que  
apponuntur] supponuntur V met ne ce] me ne te C: vis ce ne V 103 dicitur] diuiditur C  
ita] sic V 104 et<sup>1</sup>] etc. V 104-105 quod dicit om. C 105 hec om. C  
106 aduerbia<sup>1</sup> om. V 108 sedule om. C sed spatio unius verbi relicto producuntur]  
-cunt C idest...Tullii om. V sed spatio trium verborum relicto 109 m corr. ex em V  
tuatim om. et spatio unius verbi relicto add. natam C quod dicit om. C 110 e etc.] a C



250. Consequenter ponit alias regulas, dicens quod si aduerbium terminetur in *i*, corripit / penultimam, ut *vesperi*; si in *o*, acuit ultimam ad differentiam C 29rb datiuorum illius nominis a quo descendit, ut *falso* quando est aduerbium ultima acuitur, quando est nomen grauatur. Et hoc est quod dicit, SI IN I, BREUIANTUR, etc. 115 (VII.47; 528.26)
251. Consequenter ponit alias regulas, dicens quod si aduerbium terminetur in *a*, seruat accentum supra penultimam propter coincidentiam cum nomine, ut hoc aduerbium *una* acuitur in ultima ad differentiam eiusdem secundum quod est nomen. Item, si terminetur in *as*, similiter in ultima acuitur et eadem ratione, ut 120 *alias* secundum quod est nomen grauatur, secundum quod est aduerbium acuitur in ultima. Et hoc est quod dicit, SI IN A, SIMILITER, etc. (VII.47; 528.27)
252. Consequenter ponit alias regulas circa terminationes aduerbiorum, dicens quod si aduerbium terminetur in *er*, corripitur in penultima, ut *breuiter*; si in *ol*, similiter, ut *edepol*; si in *c*, acuit ultimam, et huius causa est usus solum, ut 125 *illic*, *istic*; si in *us*, breuiat penultimam, ut *funditus*. Et hoc est quod dicit, SI IN ER, BREUIANTUR, etc. (VII.47; 528.28)
253. Consequenter dicit de aduerbiis compositis ex aduerbiis et prepositionibus quod omnia sunt sub uno accentu pronuntianda, ut *exinde*, *deinde*. Et hoc est quod dicit, NOTANDUM EST NAMQUE (VII.48; 528.30).
- 130 254. Si autem queratur super quam sillabam debet seruari ille unus accentus, dicendum quod, facta consideratione ad propriam legem et naturam accentuandi, debet acui in penultima, cum sit longa positione; facta autem consideratione ad ambiguitatem remouendam que possit esse utrum sit una dictio vel oratio, debet / acui in antepenultima; et diuersimode considerando pronuntiant ipsa diuersi V 109va 135 diuersimode.
255. Consequenter dicit de coniunctionibus quod omnes coniunctiones siue simplices siue composite sub uno accentu proferende sunt. Et hoc intelligendum est ut iam de aduerbiis dictum est [254]. Et hoc est quod dicit, HANC AUTEM REGULAM, etc. (VII.48; 528.32)
- 140 256. Consequenter dicit de prepositionibus quod, quando postponuntur suis
- 112 penultimam om. C o] e C ultimam] penul- C 113 quando] quodammodo V  
 114 post grauatur rep. quando...grauatur C quod...in] quod dicit (deinde spatium duorum  
 verborum) V: si in C breuiantur] breuiantur V 116 quod om. V 117 accentum] -tus  
 C 118 una] mimo (?) C ultima om. C post eiusdem spatium unius verbi in C  
 119 similiter...et] similiter...in C: sillaba acuitur in ultima et V 120-121 nomen...ultima]  
 aduerbium in ultima acuitur secundum quod nomen grauatur V 121 quod dicit om. C  
 122 alias om. C aduerbiorum] -bii V 123 terminetur] -natur C er] r V corripitur]  
 breuiatur V penultima] -mo V breuiter] fortiter V 124 post edepol add. edepal C  
 huius om. C 125 illic istic] illuc illic V si<sup>1</sup>] scilicet C quod dicit om. C  
 126 breuiantur] breuiantur V 128 pronuntianda] -di V 129 quod dicit om. C 130 su-  
 per] supra V 132 debet] debent V post longa add. in C 133 possit] -set C debet]  
 debent CV 134 diuersi om. C 136 post coniunctionibus add. dicens C 138 quod  
 dicit om. C 140 postponuntur] prepo- V

casualibus, accentuantur modo debito, scilicet seruando accentum in penultima vel in antepenultima, nisi intellecte sint differentie causa ut patebit inferius [274]; si autem preponantur suis casualibus, grauari habent per omnes syllabas. Et hoc est quod dicit, PREPOSITIO VERO IN FINE, etc. (VII.48; 528.33-34)

145 257. Consequenter dicit de interiectionibus quod ipse nullum certum modum accentuandi habent; aliquando enim habent principalem accentum in ultima syllaba, et aliquando in penultima: qualiter hoc intelligendum <est> patebit infra [278-279]. Et hoc est quod dicit, INTERIECTIO VERO NULLAM, etc. (VII.48; 528.34) Et sic terminatur sententia huius libelli.

150 258. Circa iam dicta incidunt dubitationes penes singulas partes, et primo dubitatur circa modum accentuandi quem determinat de verbis in generali sic: cum multa accidentia sint verbi preter coniugationem, queritur quare magis diuersificat modum accentuandi et regulas eius secundum coniugationem quam secundum aliud aliud accidens.

155 259. Ad hoc [258] dicendum quod quedam accidunt verbo ratione significationis absolute, quedam vero ratione significationis in quantum est sub tali voce et figura. Omnia enim accidentia verbi alia a figura et specie et coniugatione accidunt verbo ratione significationis tantum; ista vero tria, figura et species et coniugatio, ratione significationis in quantum res unius verbi comparatur ad rem alterius verbi  
160 et in quantum est sub tali significatione. Quia igitur accentus est proprietas vocis et non significationis proprie nec primo, ideo non diuersificatur accentus penes accidentia que insunt verbo ex parte rei set penes coniugationem que ei inest ratione signi, scilicet vocis.

260. Set tunc queritur, cum figura et species insint ex parte vocis, quare magis  
165 penes coniugationem diuersificatur accentus quam penes figuram vel speciem.

261. Ad hoc [260] dicendum quod, licet figura et species insint ei in quantum res unius verbi comparatur ad rem alterius verbi, tamen generalius diuersificatur accentus et regule accentuandi secundum coniugationem quam secundum figuram vel speciem: et propterea magis determinat diuersitatem accentuandi penes  
170 coniugationem quam penes figuram vel speciem. Et quod generalius diuersificetur penes coniugationem quam penes figuram vel speciem sic patet: verbum enim secundum coniugationem inflectitur per omnem inflexionem alterius accidentis, non autem sic est de specie et figura; possum enim dicere de omni verbo prime

141 scilicet seruando] conseruando *V* vel] modo *C* 142 sint] sit *C*: sunt *V*  
144 quod dicit *om. C* 145 nullum certum] incertum *V* 146 enim] tamen *V* 147 syllaba  
*om. V* infra] in primo *V* 148 est quod dicit] quod dicit *V*: est *C* 153 secundum<sup>1</sup>] per  
*C* quam] quod *V* 156 vero *om. C* 157 a *om. C* 158 tantum *om. V* vero tria]  
autem *C* 159 verbi<sup>2</sup> *om. C* 162 insunt verbo] sunt supra verbum *V* 163 signi scilicet]  
significationis *C* 164 figura et species] figure (*deinde spatium duorum verborum*) *V*  
167 verbi<sup>2</sup> *om. V* 169 penes] secundum *C* 170 diuersificetur] -atur *C* 171 penes<sup>2</sup>  
*om. V* 172 secundum] per *C*

coniugationis, et in omni persona, et in omni modo, et in omni figura, et in omni  
 175 specie, et sic de aliis, quoniam ipsum est prime coniugationis, non autem similiter  
 possum dicere de omni tali quoniam ipsum est simplicis figure vel composite, etc.,  
 vel primitiue speciei vel deriuatiue. Sic igitur manifestum est quare magis penes  
 coniugationem diuersificat regulas accentuandi verba potius quam penes aliquod  
 aliud accidens verbi.

180 262. Consequenter queritur quare verbum in diuersis temporibus et diuersis  
 personis diuersificat modum accentuandi, ut *amabam*, *amauero*. Item, idem queri  
 potest in nominibus; diuersificatur enim in illis accentus ita quod in diuersis casibus  
 supra sillabas diuersas fit accentus, ut *iter itineris*, *palus paludis*, etc.

263. Et sciendum quod huius [262] ratio est ut fiat discretio accidentium,  
 185 cuiusmodi sunt persona et numerus et huiusmodi. Et hoc patet sic: per hoc quod  
 augetur vel minuitur numerus sillabarum, fit de sillaba ultima non ultima et de  
 penultima non penultima, et ita transmutata sillaba ab uno loco ad alterum,  
 similiter transmutatur accentus qui fit in illa sillaba, ut patet si dicam, *amaui* et  
*amauimus*, supra eandem sillabam utrobique fit accentus principalis, set in una  
 190 dictione fit supra penultimam et in alia dictione supra penultimam propter  
 adictionem unius sillabe ad finem. Similiter autem accidit in nominibus, si quis  
 inspiciat. Idem etiam patet in verbis diuersificato tempore, ut *amabam*, *amauero*.  
 Set tota variatio ista per diuersificationem sillabarum et temporum / est ut inter se C 29va  
 distinguantur alia accidentia, ut numerus, persona et huiusmodi: quare per medium  
 195 sequitur quod diuersificatio accentus in diuersis temporibus et personis fit propter  
 discretionem accidentium.

264. Consequenter queritur circa participia accentuanda. Dicit enim quod  
 participia seruant easdem regulas accentuandi quas et nomina. Set tunc dubitatur  
 sic: participium est quod partem capit a nomine, partem a verbo; quare partim  
 200 debet mutari nomen et partim verbum; quare videtur quod non magis debeat  
 retinere modum accentuandi nominis quam verbi.

265. Item, participium deriuatur a verbo; deriuatio hec autem non solum fit  
 ratione significationis set et vocis; et accentus est proprietas vocis: quare videtur  
 quod participium seruabit accentus verbi, cum a verbo vocem seruat, et non  
 205 accentus nominis.

197-198 *De acc.* vii.45 (p. 528.14-16).

174 in<sup>4</sup> omni<sup>4</sup>] non *V* 176 ipsum *om. V* 177 magis *om. C* 178 potius quam] vel  
 dicio quod *C* 180 verbum] similiter *C* post diuersis<sup>1</sup> rep. in diuersis *V* 181 diuersifi-  
 cat] -catur *C* amauero] rit *C* item *om. V* queri] qui *C* 182 illis] illa *C*  
 184 sciendum] dicendum *V* accidentium] accentuum scilicet *C* 187 transmutata] omnis  
 mutata *C* 190 dictione<sup>2</sup> *om. V* 192 etiam] autem *V* amabam] -bant *V*  
 193 per] secundum *V* 194 alia *om. C* 194-195 medium sequitur] modum similiter *C*  
 195 quod diuersificatio] autem diuersificatur *V* 202 hec *om. C* 204 seruat] sumat (?) *V*

266. Ad hoc [265] quod accentus est propter discretionem significationis; et discretio significationis maxime discernitur penes finem: unde accentus attenditur in relatione ad finem. Set participium in fine et terminatione magis conuenit cum nomine quam cum verbo, et propterea magis tenet modum accentuandi nominis  
 210 quam verbi. Quod autem in fine magis conueniat cum nomine manifestum est per hoc quod declinatur per casuales figuras penes genus et numerum sicuti et nomen. Aliquando enim est participium confundens sub una terminatione omne genus, ut quando terminatur in *ens* vel in *ans*; aliquando autem distinguit genera per diuersas terminationes, ut *lectus -ta -tum*. Omnino autem est similis modus in nominibus,  
 215 et ita magis conuenit participium cum nomine in terminando quam cum verbo.

267. Ad primum obiectum [264] dicendum quod participium capit partem sue significationis a nomine et partem a verbo: quare, cum accentus non insit ratione significationis, non oportet quod participium sequatur in accentu partim nomen et partim verbum, quia accentus inest ei ex parte vocis.

220 268. Ad alterum [265] dicendum est quod participium secundum deriuationem vocem recipit a verbo, unde secundum principium vocis magis conuenit cum verbo; set secundum terminationem magis conuenit cum nomine et differt a verbo: unde, quia penes finem attenditur accentus, ut dictum est [266], oportet quod participium sequatur nomen in accentu.

225 269. Consequenter queritur circa pronomina hoc modo: participia sumuntur loco verborum, pronomina autem loco nominum; ergo, a proportione, sicut se habet participium ad accentum nominis, ita et pronomen et eius accentus ad accentum verbi; set participium se habet sic ad accentum nominis quod retinet eius accentum; ergo et pronomen sic se habebit ad accentum verbi, scilicet quod  
 230 retinebit eius accentum.

270. Ad hoc [269] dicendum quod non est proportio similis, quia participium sumitur loco verbi ita scilicet quod retinet similem figurationem cum nomine in fine, et propterea habet similem modum accentuandi cum nomine; set pronomen non habet similem terminationem in fine cum verbo neque sic ponitur loco  
 235 nominis ut terminationem seruet similem cum verbo, et propterea non habet similem / modum accentuandi cum verbo. Si pronomen non habet similem  
 V 109vb terminationem in fine cum verbo neque sic ponitur loco nominis ut terminationem seruet similem cum verbo et propterea non habet similem accentum cum verbo,

208 terminatione] -nacio V    211 sicuti] sicut C    212 aliquando] aliter C    est] distinguit C    212-213 confundens...distinguit om. C    213 autem] enim C    217 non om. V    218 accentu] -tum V    219 ei om. V    220 alterum] ultimum C    222 set] set vel (?) V; om. C    224 accentu] -tum V    225 hoc modo] sic C    226 loco<sup>1</sup> verborum] loco (corr. ex locorum) V    227 ita et<sup>1</sup>] sic se habet V    228 sic om. C    229 habebit] habet V    229, 232 scilicet om. V    234 similem...238 habet om. C    236 verbo] nomine V

et ita deficit similitudo supra quam fundata fuit proportio, et ita videtur quod  
240 proportio nulla.

271. Consequenter queritur de modo accentuandi aduerbia et prepositiones  
hoc modo: quare, scilicet, aduerbia habent determinatos accentus non fuerit  
differentie causa siue preponantur siue postponantur verbis vel aliis et non similiter  
prepositiones; non enim semper habent prepositiones determinatum accentum siue  
245 preponantur siue postponantur.

272. Item, queritur quare prepositio preposita suo casuali grauatur in omnibus  
sillabis, postposita vero acuitur in principio et retinet generalem modum accen-  
tuandi nisi fuerit differentie causa, ut in hac prepositione *pone*.

273. Ad primum [271] dicendum quod aduerbia determinatam habent signifi-  
250 cationem semper respectu prepositionum et eandem siue preponantur siue postpo-  
nantur, et propterea non mutant suos accentus siue stent ante siue post; prepositio-  
nes vero non similiter habent determinatam significationem nec quasi eandem cum  
preponuntur et postponuntur. Non habent significationem determinatam quia  
prepositiones significant eandem habitudinem que per casualem significatur: unde  
255 sua significatio ab adiunctione casualis determinatur. Item, non habent eandem  
significationem quando preponuntur et postponuntur: quando enim preponuntur  
modum prepositionis habent, quando autem postponuntur suis casualibus quasi  
modum aduerbii habent; tunc enim proferuntur quasi non respiciendo casualia nec  
eis desinendo, set quando proferuntur sine casualibus aduerbia sunt. Et sic quasi  
260 alteram significationem habent in preponendo et postponendo, et propterea non  
habent utraque unum modum accentuandi determinatum set diuersificatum.

274. Ad secundum [272] dicendum quod prepositio significat eandem habi-  
tudinem que consignificatur per casuale, et hoc habet cum preponitur, et propterea  
unitur suo casuali, quasi indiuisum ab ipso. Vnde respicit casuale sicut sillaba  
265 respicit totam dictionem cuius est pars ab ipsa indiuisa, et ad hoc designandum  
grauatur in omnibus sillabis cum preponitur, et tunc habet naturalem accentum  
prepositionis, scilicet quod retineat accentum per modum unius sillabe. Quando  
autem prepositio postponitur suo casuali, non retinet ordinationem naturalem, nec  
ponitur sub ordinatione que significat idem / quod significat ut indiuisum a suo C 29vb  
270 casuali. Vnde, quia mutat ordinem debitum prepositionis, mutat et accentum  
debitum eidem, et hoc dupliciter: si enim habeat concidentiam cum alia parte,

239 et<sup>2</sup>...quod] quare V    243 preponantur] -natur C    postponantur] -natur C    non  
om. V    244 determinatum] -nant C    256 quando<sup>2</sup>] quia C    258 proferuntur quasi] quod  
(quasi add. s.s. al. man.) C    259 desinendo set] desinentia scilicet C    post quando expunx.  
propter se V    259-260 quasi...habent] habent alteram significationem habendo C    261 utra-  
que] utroque modo V    264 sicut] set cum C    266 in om. C    267 accentum] ad modum  
et C    268 prepositio postponitur suo] prepositio preponitur suo V; postponitur suo scilicet C  
ordinationem] ordinem V    nec] non V    269 idem] id V    270 prepositionis] -nem C

acuitur in fine propter ambiguitatem tollendam, ut superius dictum est de hac dictione *pone* [95]; si autem non habeat concidentiam cum alia parte, tunc retinet modum generalem accentuandi et acuitur in principio vel in medio, sicut *circiter*,

275 *aduersum*.

275. Consequenter queritur circa hoc quod dicit de interiectionibus. Dicit enim quod interiectiones non seruant certam regulam accentuandi et tamen acuuntur in fine vel in medio. Videtur enim quod implicet opposita quia, si habeant in fine vel in medio accentum, habent accentum determinatum, et dicitur quod non

280 et tamen quod habent accentum in medio vel in fine.

276. Item, in *Magno* dicit quod interiectiones non habent certos accentus; set habere accentum in medio vel in fine est habere accentum determinatum: quare videtur quod dicat sibi contrarium.

277. Item, si seruant accentus, queritur quare magis in medio vel in fine quam

285 in principio.

278. Ad primum [275] dicendum est quod hoc quod dicit, non seruant certos accentus, hoc est intelligendum quando proferuntur sine deliberatione, scilicet quando significant affectus subito prolatos et sine deliberatione animi. Aliquando autem significant affectus prolatos cum deliberatione, et quando sic significant et

290 sic proferuntur cum deliberatione, tunc possunt retinere certum accentum in medio vel in fine. Et sic non est contrarietas implicita in dicto auctoris.

279. Vel aliter potest dici quod hoc quod dicit, interiectiones non habent certos accentus [276], hoc est quod non habent accentus determinatos circa aliquem locum, scilicet in fine tantum vel in medio, set nunc in medio, nunc in fine,

295 secundum diuersas dispositiones ipsius proferentis. Penes hoc enim quod ipse proferens afficitur, magis faciendū moram in proferendo supra unam sillabam quam supra alteram, vel magis deprimendo unam quam alteram, siue sit media, siue sit ultima, penes hoc, scilicet, diuersificatur accentus interiectionis ita quod non habet ipsum certum, nec in certo loco. Set hoc quod dicit, accentum habent in medio

300 vel in fine, hoc intelligendum est ex dispositione ipsius afficientis et proferentis: potest enim sic disponi quod eleuet sillabam mediam vel ultimam indifferenter vel deprimat.

276-278 *De acc.* vii.48 (p. 528.34-35).

281 *Prisc., Inst. gramm.* 15.42 (GL 3.91:20-22).

272 tollendam] remouendam *V* 273 habeat] habet *V* tunc] cum *C* 274-275 circiter aduersum] terminatur ad diuisum (?) *C* 277 certam regulam] regulam dictam *C* 278 opposita] opponitur *C* si habeant] significant *C* 279 dicitur] dicit *V* 280 quod *om.* *V* 284 accentus] -tum *C* 286 hoc *om.* *C* 288 subito *corr. ex* subitos *C*: subditos *V* 289-290 quando...deliberatione *om.* *C* 291 implicita *om.* *C* 292 hoc...dicit *om.* *V* 296 supra] super *V* 297 sit<sup>2</sup> *om.* *C* 298 scilicet *om.* *V* 301 post sillabam *canc.* in medio *V*

280. Dato autem quod habeat accentum supra locum debitum et determinatum, scilicet quando proferuntur cum deliberatione ut dictum est [278], ratio tunc  
 305 quare magis seruant accentum supra sillabam ultimam vel mediam quam supra primam [277] talis est, scilicet, quod inordinatio secundum naturam per artem reducatur ad ordinationem, quia ita est in veritate quod interiectiones significant affectus prolatos subito, et propterea in fine secundum naturam maxime fit depressio. Set accentus principalis, cum consistat in eleuatione, moderat depressionem: et propterea, ad hoc quod ista inordinatio secundum naturam que est in  
 310 deprimendo reducatur ad ordinationem per artem, tenet interiectio accentum in fine vel in loco proximo ipsi fini.

303 dato] dico (?) *V*      debitum *om.* *V*      304 ratio tunc] tunc queritur ratio *C*  
 305 sillabam *om.* *V*      306 talis est *om.* *V*      quod inordinatio] ut in ydeam *C*      309 consistat] -tit *V*      309-310 moderat depressionem] depressioni (*post spatium duorum verborum*) *V*  
 310 inordinatio] ordi- *C*      in *om.* *V*      311 per] secundum *V*      312 post fini *add.* Explicit *C*, Expliciunt notule libri barbarismi et accentus, et ideo laus in terminatione operis deo referatur, quia omnis laus in fine canitur *V*

# THE UNIVOCITY OF THE CONCEPT OF BEING IN THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY: II. THE *DE ENTE* OF PETER THOMAE\*

*Stephen D. Dumont*

**D**UNS Scotus' doctrine that there is a concept of being univocally common to God and creatures met with controversy even among his own disciples.<sup>1</sup> This has already been shown in the case of William of Alnwick (d. 1333), a close

\* I wish to express my appreciation to the following libraries for granting me permission to publish the *De ente* edited from their manuscript sources: Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale; Oxford, Magdalen College; Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana; Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek.

The edition of the Latin text was produced with the assistance of computer programmes written by Rosalie Dieteman of The Franciscan Institute, St. Bonaventure, N. Y., and by Professor Norman P. Zacour. I am grateful to Ms. Dieteman, The Franciscan Institute, and Professor Zacour for so generously making their programmes available to me.

Below are the abbreviations used for the works of Scotus and editions cited in both the study and the edition. In addition, quotations from unedited portions of Peter Thomae's works are cited according to the manuscript sigla given on p. 217 below.

<i>Lect.</i>	= <i>Lectura</i>
<i>Ord.</i>	= <i>Ordinatio</i>
<i>QQ De an.</i>	= <i>Quaestiones super libros Aristotelis De anima</i>
<i>QQ Metaph.</i>	= <i>Quaestiones subtilissimae super libros Metaphysicorum Aristotelis</i>
<i>ArL</i>	= <i>Aristoteles Latinus</i> , ed. L. Minio-Paluello (Bruges-Paris, 1939-).
<i>Azcona</i>	= <i>Doctoris fundati Petri de Atarrabia sive de Navarra In primum Sententiarum scriptum</i> , ed. Pio Sagüés Azcona, 2 vols. (Madrid, 1974).
<i>Buytaert</i>	= <i>Peter Aureoli Scriptum super primum Sententiarum</i> , ed. Eligius M. Buytaert, 2 vols. (St. Bonaventure, N. Y., 1956).
<i>Hooper-Buytaert</i>	= <i>Petrus Thomae O.F.M., Quodlibet</i> , ed. M. Rachel Hooper and Eligius M. Buytaert (St. Bonaventure, N. Y., 1957).
<i>Dumont</i>	= 'The Univocity of the Concept of Being in the Fourteenth Century: Duns Scotus and William of Alnwick', <i>Mediaeval Studies</i> 49 (1987) 1-75.
<i>Iunt.</i>	= <i>Aristotelis Opera omnia cum Averrois commentariis</i> , 11 vols. (Venice: apud Iuntas, 1562-74).
<i>Vat.</i>	= <i>I. Duns Scoti Opera omnia studio et cura Commissionis Scotisticae ad fidem codicum edita praeside Carolo Balić</i> , vols. 1-7, 16-18 (Vatican City, 1950-82).
<i>Vivès</i>	= <i>Joannis Duns Scoti Opera omnia</i> , editio nova iuxta editionem Waddingi xii tomos continentem... recognita, 26 vols. (Paris: Vivès, 1891-95).

<sup>1</sup> On Scotus' doctrine of univocity and its early reception, see Stephen F. Brown, 'Avicenna and the Unity of the Concept of Being: The Interpretations of Henry of Ghent, Duns Scotus, Gerard of Bologna and Peter Aureoli', *Franciscan Studies* 25 (1965) 117-50; Dumont, pp. 1-19 and bibliographies on pp. 1 note 1, 1-2 note 2, 4 note 7, 4-5 note 9, 5 note 10, 29-30 notes 100-105.



associate and secretary of Scotus, who modified and severely criticized central aspects of his master's theory of univocity.<sup>2</sup> Although Alnwick's criticisms of Scotus on this point proved very influential, they were themselves in turn attacked. One of the most formidable of these critiques is contained in the lengthy *De ente* by the Spanish Scotist Peter Thomae (d. 1340), one of Alnwick's own contemporary Franciscans.<sup>3</sup> Studied mostly for his treatise on the formal distinction (*De modis distinctionum*),<sup>4</sup> Peter first attracted notice for his accurate references to

<sup>2</sup> Dumont, pp. 9-29.

<sup>3</sup> Little is known of the life of Peter Thomae. A Franciscan of the province of St. James of Compostela, he studied theology at Paris, from which period survives a *reportatio* version of his *Sentences* and a *Quodlibet*. He was present at the condemnation of Arnold of Villanova in 1316 and was then listed as a *lector* in the Franciscan *studium* in Barcelona. It is generally discounted that he knew Scotus at Paris or studied with Peter Aureoli at Toulouse. A decade later he is found at Avignon as an abbreviator for Pope John xxii. In 1340 he is incarcerated by the Inquisition on charges of witchcraft and dies a short time later in prison. On Peter's life and works, see Martí de Barcelona, 'Fra Pere Tomàs (xiv), Doctor strenuus et invincibilis', *Estudis franciscans* 39 (1927) 90-103; Eligius M. Buytaert, 'The Scholastic Writings of Petrus Thomae' in *Theologie in Geschichte und Gegenwart: Michael Schmaus zum sechzigster Geburtstag*, ed. Johann Auer and Hermann Volk (Munich, 1957), pp. 927-40; Ignatius Brady, 'The Later Years of Petrus Thomae, OFM' in *Studia mediaevalia et mariologica P. Carolo Balić OFM septuagesimum expleti annum dicata* (Rome, 1971), pp. 249-57. The only work of Peter's edited is his *Quodlibet* (see note 1 above). On Peter's doctrine and influence, see in addition to Bridges given in the next note: Ignatius Brady, 'Comment on Allan Wolter's "Duns Scotus and the Existence and Nature of God"', *Proceedings of the American Catholic Philosophical Association* 28 (1954) 124-25 and 'The Development of the Doctrine on the Immaculate Conception in the Fourteenth Century after Aureoli', *Franciscan Studies* 15 (1955) 175-202; Pio Sagüés Azcona, 'Apuntes para la historia del escotismo en España en el siglo xiv' in *De doctrina Ioannis Duns Scoti*, 4 vols. (Rome, 1968), 4.13-20; Isaac Vázquez, 'Aportaciones histórico-literarias a la historia del pensamiento medieval en España', *Antonianum* 47 (1972) 648-55 and 'Rutas e hitos escotismo primitivo en España' in *Homo et mundus. Acta quinti Congressus Scotistici Internationalis*, ed. Camille Bérubé (Rome, 1984), p. 427; Francesco Santi, 'Gli *Scripta spiritualia* di Arnau de Vilanova', *Studi medievali*, 3rd Ser., 26 (1985) 1007. Prospero T. Stella attributes to Peter, in addition to the works listed by Buytaert, the *Quaestiones in I et II libros De anima* and two *Quaestiones ordinariae de conceptibus transcendentibus* contained in Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Vat. lat. 869, fols. 51v-102r and 29r-44r respectively. In a forthcoming article I shall give my reasons against Peter's authorship. For Stella's arguments and partial editions of the *De anima* questions, see "Res generabilis simplex est": il radicalismo antiilemorfico di Tommaso Barneby e Giacomo di Carseto nella recensione di Pietro Tomàs (Thomae)', *Salesianum* 38 (1976) 755-806 and 'Erronea et horrenda... pulchra et solemnis... nel antropologie in concorrenza nel Com. in I-II *De anima* di Pietro Tomàs', *Aquinas* 21 (1978) 400-38. Lohr has definitively shown that the *Quaestiones in Metaphysicam*, attributed by Künzle first to Peter Thomae and then to Francis of Meyronnes, in fact belong to Francis of Marchia: Pio Künzle, 'Mitteilungen aus Codex Mazarine 3490 zum Schrifttum des Franziskaners Petrus Thomae, vorab zu seinen "Quaestiones in Metaphysicam"', *Archivum franciscanum historicum* 59 (1966) 3-37 and 'Petrus Thomae oder Franciscus de Maironis?', *ibid.* 61 (1968) 462; Charles H. Lohr, 'New Material concerning Franciscus de Marchia, *Quaestiones super Metaphysicam*', *Antonianum* 46 (1971) 486-88.

<sup>4</sup> On the doctrine and complex textual tradition of the *De modis distinctionum*, also called the *De formalitatibus*, see Geoffrey Bridges, *Identity and Distinction in Petrus Thomae, O.F.M.* (St. Bonaventure, N. Y., 1959); Walter Hoeres, 'Zur Ontologie von Petrus Thomae', *Franziskanische Studien* 43 (1961) 374-79; Antonio Poppi, 'Il contributo dei formalisti padovani al problema delle

Scotus' corpus,<sup>5</sup> his rich citations by name of his contemporaries,<sup>6</sup> and his lively defense of the Subtle Doctor against halfway scotists (*aliquialiter scotizantes*), among whom he would count Alnwick.<sup>7</sup> What is remarkable both historically as well as philosophically is that Alnwick and Peter derive from Scotus' doctrine of univocity exactly contradictory conclusions on the predication of being, neither of which is the position of Scotus himself. That is, both Alnwick and Peter agree with Scotus that the concept of being is univocal, but contradict each other, and indeed Scotus, on the nature and extent of its univocity.

distinzioni' in *Problemi e figure della scuola scotista del Santo* (Padua, 1966), pp. 628-34; Wolfgang Hübener, 'Robertus Anglicus und die formalistische Tradition' in *Philosophie im Mittelalter: Entwicklungslinien und Paradigmen*, ed. Jan P. Beckmann et al. (Hamburg, 1987), pp. 329-53.

<sup>5</sup> Because of his habit of citing Scotus and his contemporaries by name, Peter has been helpful in sorting out problems of attribution. The best known instance of this for Scotus concerns the contested *Theoremata* (Vivès 5.2-128) which in the *De ente* Peter twice cites as Scotus' own: 'Ad quantum praemitto primo, quod quia ut dicit Scotus in suis *Theorematibus* "intelligibile intellectionem natura praecedere necesse est"...' (*De ente* q.14 [V 62r]); "intelligibile autem natura praecedere necesse est", ut ait Scotus in *Theorematibus* (*De ente* q.10 [V 44r]); cf. *Theoremata* 1 (Vivès 5.2). On the *Theoremata*, see Léon Baudry, 'En lisant Jean le Chanoine', *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* 9 (1934) 175-97; Charles Balić, 'A propos de quelques ouvrages faussement attribués à J. Duns Scot', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 2 (1930) 165-70; *Ioannis Duns Scoti Doctoris Mariani theologiae marianae elementa* (Šibenik, 1933), pp. cxxi-cxlvii; 'De critica textuali scholasticorum scriptis accommodata', *Antonianum* 20 (1945) 292-96; Allan B. Wolter, 'The "Theologism" of Duns Scotus', *Franciscan Studies* 7 (1947) 383-98; Gedeon Gál, 'De J. Duns Scoti "Theorematum" authenticitate ex ultima parte operis confirmata', *Collectanea franciscana* 20 (1950) 5-50; [Charles Balić], 'De Ordinatione historice considerata' (Vat. 1.154\*).

<sup>6</sup> Peter's *De ente* was important in identifying the works of Richard of Conington: Victorin Doucet, 'L'œuvre scolastique de Richard de Conington, O.F.M.', *Archivum franciscanum historicum* 29 (1936) 401, 429-30. In addition to the constant citations of Henry of Ghent, Duns Scotus and Peter Aureoli, the *De ente* quotes these authors by name: Alexander of Alexandria (V 9v, 38v, 41r); Gerard of Bologna (V 8v, 38r); Gonsalvus of Spain (V 8r); James of Viterbo (V 13r, 41v); Peter of Navarre (V in marg. 43r); Robert Cowton (V 25r, 26v, 27r); Thomas Aquinas (V 6v, 26v, 38r); Master Thomas Rundel (V 40v). Rundel or Rondel was the twenty-seventh lector at the Franciscan convent at Oxford where he was regent master of theology 1288-89. For an edition of his *determinatio* entitled 'Utrum obiectum voluntatis aliquid imprimat in voluntatem' and a biographical sketch, see A. G. Little and F. Pelster, *Oxford Theology and Theologians c. A.D. 1282-1302* (Oxford, 1934), pp. 278-79, 338-43; cf. A. B. Emden, *A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford to A.D. 1500*, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1959), 3.1588-89. Peter probably knew of Rundel's work through the *Sentences* of William of Ware, which quotes Rundel's opinions. See Josef Lechner, 'Beiträge zum mittelalterlicher Franziskanerschrifttum, vornehmlich der Oxforder Schule des 13./14. Jahrhunderts, auf Grund einer Florentiner Wilhelm von Ware-Hs.', *Franziskanische Studien* 19 (1932) 107-109.

<sup>7</sup> 'Ideo dicunt alii aliquialiter scotizantes quod conceptus entis est unus conceptus realis, sed non dicitur conceptus realis propter unitatem realem obiecti extra animam. Non enim sequitur "est unus conceptus realis, ergo habet pro fundamento proximo aliquid unum reale", immo "ergo non habet pro fundamento aliquid subiective nisi intellectum in quo est"' (*De ente* q.11 [V 43r-v]). This is a direct quotation of Alnwick's text. See Dumont, p. 63.806-808.

## I

## WILLIAM OF ALNWICK AND DUNS SCOTUS

While Alnwick fully accepts and defends Scotus' doctrine that being can be grasped in an irreducibly simple notion univocally common to God and creatures, he radically modifies one of its essential features and outright rejects a second. First, Alnwick admits, in contrast to Scotus' most definitive position, that univocity does not reduce being to a genus because being is related to its inferiors as a species to its individuals. The reasoning here is that a species descends into its inferiors without addition and as a whole, so that the species expresses the entire reality of the individual. A genus, on the other hand, does not descend as a whole but as a part to which differences are added. Consequently, being is predicated of its inferiors as a *species specialissima* rather than as a genus, since it, like a species, contains the entire reality of its inferiors.<sup>8</sup> Scotus does explore the species model as an account of the non-generic character of being in both his *QQ Metaph.* and *QQ De anima*.<sup>9</sup> It is entirely absent, however, from the more expansive treatments of univocity in the *Lectura*, *Ordinatio*, and *Collatio* where Scotus bases his definitive account of the non-generic character of being on his innovative doctrine of 'intrinsic modes'.<sup>10</sup> The apparent explanation for the absence of the species account in these latter works is that it is inconsistent with Scotus' doctrine of individuation, according to which a species does descend to singulars through some added reality.<sup>11</sup> Unlike Scotus, however, Alnwick can consistently accommodate the species account since he rejects Scotus' doctrine of individuation in favor of Henry of Ghent's position that individuation takes place through negation alone.<sup>12</sup> The result is that for Alnwick being descends through no addition because

<sup>8</sup> See Dumont, p. 15 and texts at pp. 61.730-751 and 71.1014-27.

<sup>9</sup> Dumont, p. 10; Scotus, *QQ Metaph.* 4.1 nn.7, 9-10 (Vivès 7.149a, 150b-51a); *QQ De anima* q.21 n.13 (Vivès 3.618b).

<sup>10</sup> One would expect to find the species account of univocity in the following texts: 1 *Lect.* d.3 nn.105-123 (Vat. 16.264-72); d.8 nn.119-22 (Vat. 17.42-43); 1 *Ord.* d.3 nn.152-66 (Vat. 3.94-103); d.8 nn.39, 120-27, 136 (Vat. 4.169, 212-16, 221).

<sup>11</sup> In *QQ Metaph.* 4.1 the species model is explicitly tied to the view that the individual adds nothing to the species: 'Aliter dici potest, quod sicut individua duo se totis numero differunt, et se totis sunt unum in specie, nec est aliquid reale in altero nisi natura speciei, sic hic de generibus sub ente' (*QQ Metaph.* 4.1 n.9 [Vivès 7.150b]). This expressly contradicts Scotus' doctrine of individuation in the *Ordinatio* and *Lectura*: 'Concedo igitur conclusiones istarum rationum, quod necesse est per aliquid positivum intrinsecum huic lapidi, tamquam per rationem propriam, repugnare sibi dividi in partes subiectivas; et illud positivum erit illud quod dicitur esse per se causa individuationis...' (2 *Ord.* d.3 n.57 [Vat. 7.416-17]); 'Et si quaeras a me quae est ista entitas individualis a qua sumitur differentia individualis...' (ibid. n.187 [Vat. 7.483]).

<sup>12</sup> For Alnwick's rejection of Scotus' doctrine of individuation, see Prospero T. Stella, 'Illi qui student in Scoto: Guglielmo di Alnwick et la "haecceitas" scotista', *Salesianum* 30 (1968) 331-87, 614-41. Cf. Henry of Ghent, *Quod.* 5.8 (ed. 1518, 1.166m).

it descends through negation.<sup>13</sup> In Alnwick's hands, therefore, the species model of being is transformed according to his own doctrine of individuation and gains a place it could never have in Scotus' scheme of univocity.

Alnwick's second point of divergence from Scotus is not a transformation but a plain rejection of a key part of his master's position. Scotus' doctrine of univocity has two parts corresponding roughly to the distinction between a univocal predicate and univocal predication.<sup>14</sup> A predicate is univocal, as opposed to equivocal, if it has single meaning (*ratio*). Predication is univocal, as opposed to denominative, if the *ratio* of a predicate is essentially included in the *ratio* of its subject.<sup>15</sup> In the first part of his doctrine, then, Scotus holds that being taken in its utmost generality is a univocal concept or predicate since it is an irreducibly simple notion (*ratio*). In the second he denies that this univocal concept can be predicated univocally or quidditatively (*in quid*) of all else that is intelligible.<sup>16</sup> Specifically, Scotus argues that being is predicated only in a denominative manner of the properties of being, which form the other transcendentals, and of ultimate differences.<sup>17</sup> Thus, according to Scotus, being is a univocal predicate but is not univocally predicated of all things. Put in other terms, being has a single univocal *ratio*, but it is not essentially included in the *ratio* of all to which it is univocal.

In contradiction to the second part of Scotus' position, Alnwick maintains that being is not only a univocal predicate but is predicated univocally *in quid* of all intelligibles, including ultimate differences and the transcendental properties of being. In some nineteen arguments against Scotus, Alnwick tries to show that, when being is taken in its univocal community, everything is formally a being or nothing.<sup>18</sup> That is, being conceived in its utmost generality as anything opposed to nothing must be predicated formally or not at all. At this level of generality, according to Alnwick, there can be no middle ground, such as denominative

<sup>13</sup> Dumont, p. 71.1015-22.

<sup>14</sup> The first part, the fact of a univocal concept of being, occupies 1 *Ord.* d.3 nn.26-55 (Vat. 3.18-38), and the second, the nature and extent of univocity, is found at *ibid.* nn.129-37, 147-51 (Vat. 3.80-86, 91-94). Alnwick himself divides Scotus' position into two corresponding articles. See Dumont, p. 42.203-206.

<sup>15</sup> *Super Praedicamenta* q.3 n.5 (Vivès 1.443b); 1 *Ord.* d.8 n.89 (Vat. 4.195); 3 *Ord.* d.7 q.1 n.5 (Vivès 14.336a).

<sup>16</sup> On *in quid* predication, see Allan B. Wolter, *The Transcendentals and Their Function in the Metaphysics of Duns Scotus* (St. Bonaventure, N. Y., 1946), pp. 79-81. Strictly speaking, univocal predication is broader than predication *in quid*, which is the expression Scotus prefers. As Wolter explains, the latter requires that the predicate be included in the subject in the *manner* of a *quid* or subsistent part. But when discussing being, Scotus seems to identify the two. See 1 *Ord.* d.8 n.89 (Vat. 4.195-96).

<sup>17</sup> 1 *Ord.* d.3 nn.131-37, 150-51 (Vat. 3.81-86, 92-94).

<sup>18</sup> Dumont, pp. 22-24, 47.341-52.497.

predication, between being and non-being.<sup>19</sup> Furthermore, Alnwick argues that Scotus is inconsistent to hold that being is a univocal predicate and then to deny its univocal predication of all things. Alnwick attempts to prove inconsistency by showing that Scotus' own arguments for a univocal concept of being also constitute arguments for its *in quid* predication.<sup>20</sup> On Alnwick's view, then, being is univocal in a meaningful way only if it is essentially included in, and univocally predicated of, everything to which it is univocal.

The ultimate source of disagreement between the two is most clearly seen in their treatment of ultimate differences. Scotus defines an ultimate difference as that which includes no further difference.<sup>21</sup> Consider, then, any two differences. If they include being, then they are not wholly diverse but differ properly themselves. They thus include further differences and hence cannot be ultimate. These further differences then include being or not. Either this process of analysis is infinite, or it reaches some difference which does not include being.<sup>22</sup> Such a difference will be wholly diverse from all other differences and will have an irreducibly simple concept.<sup>23</sup>

Scotus' above argument rests on two premisses: (a) if analysis is not to be infinite it must terminate with ultimate differences which do not themselves differ but are wholly diverse; (b) differences which are wholly diverse cannot include being. Alnwick's strategy is to attack (b) by denying that things are properly different, as opposed to diverse, simply because they agree in being. The categories are a case in point. They are totally diverse yet essentially include being, because, according to Scotus himself, being is predicated of the categories *in quid*.<sup>24</sup> Thus, on Scotus' argument, the categories would themselves have differences, since they

<sup>19</sup> Antonius Andreas, writing before Alnwick, sees Scotus as distinguishing between what is formally and really a being. Something can be a being really and yet not formally. Thus, according to Andreas, there is a middle ground between nothing and what is formally a being, but not between nothing and what is really a being: 'Et per consequens *a* est ens realiter, nec est nihil, non tamen est ens formaliter. Est enim dare medium inter ens formaliter et nihil... tamen inter ens realiter et nihil non est medium' (Antonius Andreas, *QQ Metaph.* 1.1 [ed. Venice, 1473, fol. 4rb]; cf. 5.6 [fol. 39rb]). On Andreas, see Martí de Barcelona, 'Fra Antoni Andreu, O.M. Doctor dulcífilius (s. xiv)', *Criterion* 5 (1929) 321-46; Charles H. Lohr, 'Medieval Latin Aristotle Commentaries: Authors A-F', *Traditio* 23 (1967) 363-65; Camille Bérubé, 'Antoine André, témoin et interprète de Scot', *Antonianum* 54 (1979) 386-446.

<sup>20</sup> Dumont, pp. 47.341-49.397.

<sup>21</sup> On ultimate differences, see 1 *Ord.* d.3 nn.131, 159-61 (Vat. 3.81, 97-100); 2 *Ord.* d.3 nn.170, 179, 183 (Vat. 7.475, 479, 481).

<sup>22</sup> 1 *Ord.* d.3 n.131 (Vat. 3.81).

<sup>23</sup> Irreducibly simple concepts are incapable of further resolution. They express either only a *quid* or only a *quale*. The former is the concept of being, the latter the concepts of the properties of being and ultimate differences. Cf. 1 *Lect.* d.2 n.24, d.3 n.68 (Vat. 16.118-19, 250); 1 *Ord.* d.2 n.31 (Vat. 2.142-43), d.3 n.71 (Vat. 3.49); *QQ Metaph.* 6.3 n.6 (Vivès 7.338b).

<sup>24</sup> 1 *Ord.* d.3 n.137 (Vat. 3.85).

would properly differ. They would consequently be species and not genera. Alnwick concludes that things do not differ simply because of an agreement in being and a diversity in something else. As a result, differences can be ultimate and still essentially include being.<sup>25</sup>

Alnwick's counter-example of the categories appears designed to show that what is totally diverse in *reality* can support *in quid* predication of being. Alnwick had available an even more explicit counter-example from Scotus, who concedes that being is predicated *in quid* of God and creature even though they are wholly diverse in reality. Alnwick could have then argued that ultimate differences need not be any more diverse in reality than God and creature, so that if being is predicated *in quid* of the latter, *a fortiori* of the former.<sup>26</sup> Scotus, however, would probably have regarded both counter-examples as irrelevant. Although he would concede that both the categories and God and creatures are wholly diverse *in reality*, he would have denied that they are wholly diverse *in concept*.<sup>27</sup> But Scotus' argument is that the *concepts* of ultimate differences must be wholly diverse to avoid infinite regress.<sup>28</sup>

In sum, Scotus' argument is that if the only irreducibly simple concept is that of being, then conceptual analysis will be infinite. Since it is a contradiction for one irreducibly simple concept to be included essentially in another, being cannot be predicated *in quid* of all that is intelligible. Alnwick, on the other hand, could not see how something could be a being *really* but not *formally*, at least if being is taken in its most general sense as anything opposed to nothing. As a result, Alnwick appears to be holding that the only irreducibly simple concept is that of being.

<sup>25</sup> Dumont, p. 52.499-53.507.

<sup>26</sup> John Bassoles reports Alnwick's argument against Scotus in precisely this way: 'De passionibus et differentiis ultimis potest argui quod ens praedicatur quidditative de ipsis. Et primo de ultimis differentiis sic, ex dictis eorum [sc. Scoti] procedendo contra eos: non minus distinguuntur extra intellectum Deus et creatura, substantia et accidens, quam duae differentiae ultimae cuiusdam generis, quia illa se totis distinguuntur et in nullo reali conveniunt, cum Deus non sit contractus ad genus aliquod sicut duae differentiae ad idem genus. Sed hoc non obstante ens est univocum quidditative ad Deum et creaturam accidens et substantiam, ut dicunt, igitur ad differentiam et differentiam, et est contra primam rationem [sc. Scoti]' (1 *Ord.* d.8 q.1 [ed. Paris, 1526, fol. 87vb]). On Bassoles' life and his doctrine of intuitive cognition, see Marcellus Pasiecznik, 'John de Bassolis', *Franciscan Studies* 13 (1953) 59-77 and 14 (1954) 49-80.

<sup>27</sup> '...Deus et creatura non sunt primo diversa in conceptibus; sunt tamen primo diversa in realitate, quia in nulla realitate conveniunt...' (1 *Ord.* d.8 n.82 [Vat. 4.190]); 'Nunc autem creatura et Deus conveniunt in uno conceptu absque unitate in aliqua realitate... sunt igitur primo diversa in realitate, sed non in conceptu' (1 *Lect.* d.8 n.84 [Vat. 17.29]).

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Dumont, pp. 27-28. This is at least the solution to Alnwick's objection given by his anonymous critic in the two *Quaestiones ordinariae de conceptibus transcendentibus*: 'Ista solutio [sc. Alnwick] non evacuat argumentum, quod ostendo sic: quando tu dicis quod "genera includunt ens quidditative, et tamen sunt primo diversa", nihil ad me. Ibi enim dicebatur quod prima genera erant primo diversa in re, tamen non erant primo diversa in conceptu' (Vat. lat. 869, fol. 41ra).

Whatever the cogency of Alnwick's modifications and criticisms of Scotus' univocity, they were often cited and apparently influential. Francis of Meyronnes,<sup>29</sup> Peter of Navarre,<sup>30</sup> and Landolf Caracciolo<sup>31</sup> adopt the species account of being while Peter Aureoli<sup>32</sup> and William of Ockham,<sup>33</sup> among others, hold for the universal *in quid* predication of being. Peter Thomae will criticize Alnwick on both points, but not without departing himself from the teaching of Scotus.

## II

### PETER THOMAE AND WILLIAM OF ALNWICK

#### A. *Being and Species*

Peter Thomae was not the first to attack Alnwick's adoption of the species model of being. Perhaps a few years earlier, Anfredus Gonteri, who also lectured

<sup>29</sup> See Dumont, pp. 17-19.

<sup>30</sup> For Peter of Navarre's treatment of the species model, see pp. 196-98 below.

<sup>31</sup> '...tertio quia genus sumitur a forma dicente medium inter potentiam et actum, secundum Commentatorem x *Metaphysicae*. Ens autem non potest esse talis media forma cum sit primus conceptus respectu omnium. Ergo solum competit sibi praedicatio speciei specialissimae, quia sicut species specialissima sumitur [sumpta ms.] a toto individuo, non ratione unius partis, sed ratione totius, ita ens sumitur a toto et praedicat totum ratione totius. Hoc idem probo deducendo: illud quod contrahitur contractione sui modi contrahitur modo speciei et praedicatur modo speciei. Ita est de ente.... Igitur praedicatur sicut species, quia enim species contrahitur per gradum individualement ad esse individuum, qui gradus non est extra speciem. Ideo species praedicat totum individuum ratione totius. Ita ens quod contrahitur contractione sui modi intrinseci praedicabit totum ratione totius, sicut et species. ... Ex his omnibus sequuntur tria corollaria. Primum quod patet quod aliter descendit ens in sua inferiora, aliter genus in suas species. Descendit enim ens in sua inferiora per gradum intrinsecum qui est idem formaliter cum eo, quamvis differant solum modaliter. Genus autem descendit in inferiora per conceptum existentem extra ipsum formaliter, scilicet differentiam, quia genus secundum Commentatorem x *Metaphysicae* sumitur a forma dicente medium inter potentiam et actum, id est a forma dicente actum imperfectum sed expectante [corr. in marg. ex ex praecedente] per differentiam ultimo perfici. Secundum corollarium, quod ideo ens descendit in inferiora nullo addito, et idcirco praedicat totum, quia contrahitur contractione sui modi qui est idem cum eo. Descendit autem genus in inferiora aliquo addito, scilicet differentia, et praedicat totum sumptum a parte. Tertium corollarium, quod patet dictum in pede primi articuli, scilicet quod ens praedicatur modo speciei et contrahitur, quia [quod ms.] sicut species specialissima contrahitur contractione sui gradus ad esse particulatum, et idcirco praedicat totum, ita ens contrahitur contractione sui gradus intrinseci' (Landolf Caracciolo, 1 *Sent.* d.3 qq.1-4 [Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek 1494, fols. 32vb, 33vb]). Notice that Landolf in adopting the species model holds, as does Meyronnes, that the species is individuated through a mode. See Dumont, *ibid.*

<sup>32</sup> For Aureoli see text below, ll. 545-603 and the *apparatus fontium*.

<sup>33</sup> 1 *Ord.* d.2 q.9 (*Opera theologica*, ed. Gedeon Gál et al., 10 vols. [St. Bonaventure, N. Y., 1967-85], 2.298-306). On Ockham's criticism of Scotus on this point, see Douglas C. Langston, 'Scotus and Ockham on the Univocal Concept of Being', *Franciscan Studies* 17 (1979) 105-29.

in the studium at Barcelona, had already done so in his *Sentences*.<sup>34</sup> Anfredus' critique of Alnwick anticipates Peter's on several points. As indicated, the problem is to explain how there can be a univocal concept of being without reducing being to a genus. The principal argument is formulated by Scotus in *QQ Metaph.* 4.1, which is repeated by Alnwick in his questions on univocity.<sup>35</sup> Anfredus in turn takes his whole discussion of the matter directly from Alnwick. Nothing common descends of itself into those things to which it is common. Rather, in addition to the concept of any common thing, determining or differentiating concepts are required. Thus, the univocal concept of being will be merely the concept of a genus, and the categories will consequently be species. As a first answer to this objection, Anfredus reports Alnwick's elaboration of Scotus' reply given in *QQ Metaph.* 4.1. The principle 'Nothing common descends of itself' is true of those universals that form only a part of their inferiors. This is the case with a genus which descends into its species through the addition of a difference. It is false, however, of those universals that constitute the whole of that into which they descend. Such are species, which, according to Boethius, signify the whole being of their individuals. But being descends as a whole into the categories. Thus, just as individuals are wholly identical in species and wholly diverse in number, so the categories wholly

<sup>34</sup> On Anfredus Gonteri, see Michael Schmaus, 'Uno sconosciuto discepolo di Scoto', *Rivista di filosofia neo-scolastica* 24 (1932) 327-55; Victorin Doucet, 'Der unbekannte Skotist des Vaticanus lat. 1113 Fr. Anfredus Gonteri, O.F.M.', *Franziskanische Studien* 25 (1938) 200-40; León Amorós, 'Anfredo Gontero O.F.M.', *Revista española de teología* 1 (1940-41) 345-72; J. Alfaro, 'La Immaculada Concepción en los escritos inéditos de un discípulo de Duns Escoto, Aufredo Gontier', *Gregorianum* 36 (1955) 590-617; Charles Balić, 'Annotationes ad nonnullas quaestiones circa *Ordinationem* I. Duns Scoti' (Vat. 4.15\*-28\*). Anfredus attended the Parisian lectures of Scotus, whom he claims to follow on almost every point ('Scotum, quem pro posse quasi ubique sequor, quia ipsum diu audiui'). In 1303 he is in Paris as the *socius* of Magister Alanus, Provincial of Tours, who would later work with Gonsalvus of Spain at the Council of Vienne on the problem of the Spiritual Franciscans. Scotus himself responds to Master Alan at 3 *Rep. par.* d.18 q.3 n.8 (Vivès 23.369). Anfredus is known to have lectured on the *Sentences* in Barcelona in 1322 (books 1 and 2) and in Paris in 1325 (books 1-3). Peter Thomae's *De ente* seems to be written after Anfredus' *Sentences*, since the latter are quoted in the *Sentences* of Peter of Navarre, which is in turn quoted by the *De ente*. See Brady, 'Later Years', 253 note 14 and Azcona, 1.20\*, 74\*. The manuscripts of Anfredus' *Sentences* are Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Vat. lat. 1113, fols. 1r-185v (Barcelona, book 1); Wrocław, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka 195 [I.F.184], fols. 1r-708v (Paris, book 1; Barcelona, book 2); Pamplona, Biblioteca de la Catedral 5, fols. 1r-196v (Paris, books 2 and 3). For the sections of book 1 quoted below, there are only minor differences between the Paris and Barcelona lectures. As Balić has shown in his above study, much of Anfredus' *Sentences* has been directly compiled from the *Sentences* of Henry of Harclay, chancellor of Oxford, who later in his career turned critical of Scotus. The question of Anfredus quoted below, however, has no parallel in Harclay's *Sentences*; cf. Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Vat. lat. 13687, fols. 25rb-26ra.

<sup>35</sup> Scotus, *QQ Metaph.* 4.1 nn.9, 10 (Vivès 7.150b-51a); Alnwick (ed. Dumont, p. 35.11-17). Cf. Scotus, 1 *Lect.* d.3 n.109 (Vat. 16.265); 1 *Ord.* d.3 n.157 (Vat. 3.95); d.8 n.39 (Vat. 4.196); *Collatio* edited in C. R. S. Harris, *Duns Scotus*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1927), 2.373 and Charles Balić, 'De Collationibus Ioannis Duns Scoti', *Bogoslovni vestnik* 9 (1929) 214-15.



agree in being and are wholly diverse as genera. For this reason Aristotle says that 'being is immediately a substance, quality, quantity, etc.'<sup>36</sup>

Anfredus rejects this solution of Alnwick, arguing that if being signifies the entire essence of each of the categories, and the categories are wholly diverse, as Alnwick in fact holds, then being is not a univocal but an equivocal term.<sup>37</sup> But then does Boethius' text imply that species are equivocally predicated of its individuals? Anfredus correctly locates the inadequacy of the species model in Scotus' scheme. The Boethian text, at least on Scotus' principles, means that the species is the whole *quidditative* reality of the individual.<sup>38</sup> If the species signified the entire being of its individuals according to their proper individuality, then it would be equivocal, functioning as a shared proper name. Having abandoned the first solution offered by Alnwick, Anfredus adopts his second, which is that of Scotus' *Ordinatio*. Anfredus concedes the principle 'Nothing common descends of itself' by interpreting it broadly so as to include descent through either differences proper or intrinsic modes. By appealing to intrinsic modes, which are not proper differences, being can be seen as common yet not a genus.<sup>39</sup>

<sup>36</sup> 'Ad primum argumentum contra primam conclusionem, cum dicitur quod si conceptus entis esset communis et univocus decem praedicamentis, tunc esset genus ad ea et praedicamenta species definibiles, dico quod non est verum nec consequentia tenet. Ad probationem primae partis consequentiae, quando dicitur quod nullum commune ad aliqua seipso descendit in illa, sed praeter conceptum eius communem determinabilem requiruntur conceptus determinantes, respondetur hic quod hoc est verum de illo communi quod non dicit totum esse illorum in quae descendit, sicut genus respectu speciei, quia genus dicit partem conceptus essentialis speciei. Si autem dicat totum esse illorum in quae descendit, sicut species dicit totum esse individuorum, secundum Boethium in *Commento super librum Porphyrii*, non est verum. Ens autem dicit totam essentiam decem praedicamentorum in quae descendit. Et ideo sicut duo individua sub specie se totis conveniunt in specie et se totis differunt <in> numero, ita praedicamenta decem se totis conveniunt in conceptu entis formaliter dicti de eis et se totis differunt genere. Exemplum de hoc: quod est nomen [non ms.] homo, quod se toto descendit in diversa de quibus dicitur. Et propter hoc dicit Philosophus viii *Metaphysicae* in fine quod ens statim est quid quale quantum' (Anfredus Gonteri, 1 *Sent.* d.3 q.4 'Utrum conceptus entis sit communis univoce omni enti creato et increato' [Vat. lat. 1113, fol. 61ra; cf. Wrocław 195 [I.F.184], fol. 108va]). Cf. Scotus, *QQ Metaph.* 4.1 n.9 (Vivès 7.150b); Alnwick (ed. Dumont, pp. 60.718-61.751, 71.1015-25).

<sup>37</sup> That is, being would then be a term with several proper *rationes*, thus conforming to Aristotle's definition of an equivocal as 'nomen solum commune, secundum nomen vero substantiae ratio diversa' (*Cat.* 1 [1a1-2; ArL 1.5:304]). Cf. Scotus, 1 *Ord.* d.3 n.158 (Vat. 3.96:17-97:2).

<sup>38</sup> This is in fact how Scotus interprets this text of Boethius, which, ironically, is used as an objection *against* Scotus' doctrine of individuation precisely because he claims that the individual is constituted by some addition. See 2 *Ord.* d.3 n.197 (Vat. 7.488-89); 2 *Lect.* d.3 n.180 (Vat. 18.288).

<sup>39</sup> 'Sed contra hoc arguitur, quia quando aliquid nomen dicit totam perfectionem aliquorum, si propriae rationes eorum sunt alterius rationis, illud nomen conveniret eis aequivoce. Exemplum de cane, qui signat canem latrabilem et marinam belvam et celeste sidus sub propriis rationibus. Ideo aequivoce signat ea. Ergo si ens dicit totam essentiam et conceptum essentialem omnium praedicamentorum sub propriis eorum rationibus quae sunt alterius rationis, signat ea aequivoce, vel ens dicit unam communem omnibus sub qua decem praedicamenta distinguuntur per rationes speciales additas, et stat ratio principalis, vel si signat propriam rationem singulorum et totam, signabit ea aequivoce. Et quando dicitur quod species dicit totum esse individuorum, verum est esse quidditativum

Anfredus thus decisively rejects the species model of being as found in Alnwick in favor of Scotus' definitive solution based upon intrinsic modes, also found in Alnwick. In doing so, Anfredus shows that Alnwick had in fact lumped together two different and incompatible solutions and that the first has limited success in Scotus' framework of univocity. Regrettably, Anfredus does not go further and attempt some explanation of how Alnwick, or even Scotus upon whom Alnwick depends, could have held both accounts. For an explanation of this we must turn to Peter Thomae.

Peter examines the species model of univocity in question 14 of his *De ente*.<sup>40</sup> The two preliminary opinions examined, neither of which Peter identifies, belong to Alnwick and Peter's own contemporary Franciscan and countryman, Peter of Navarre. As just shown, it is Alnwick's position that being is not contracted to its inferiors but descends of itself as a whole in the manner of a species.<sup>41</sup> Peter of Navarre goes slightly farther than Alnwick and holds that being is not *really* but only *conceptually* contracted to its inferiors. This follows from his view that the univocal concept of being has no real foundation but results only from an indifference in the mode of conception.<sup>42</sup> Consequently, according to Peter of

et specificum, sed non totum esse individuale sub propriis rationibus individualibus, quia tunc aequivoce signaret, sicut hoc nomen Michael, quod convenit huic et illi, dicitur aequivoce de eis, quia signat eos sub propriis rationibus alterius rationis. Ideo dicendum est aliter cum dicitur quod nullum univocum seipso descendit in univocata. Verum est "seipso" in universali accepto, sed per differentias acceptas ab alia realitate vel per modos intrinsecos eiusdem realitatis. Et illo modo ens in communi descendit in decem praedicamenta per esse in se et esse [essentia ms.] in alio, sicut per finitum et infinitum descendit in ens creatum et increatum, sicut patet in quaestione praecedenti' (Vat. lat. 1113, fol. 61ra). For Alnwick, see Dumont, pp. 69.982-70.985.

<sup>40</sup> 'Utrum conceptus entis sit immediate contrahibilis per aliquas differentias' (V 55v-59v).

<sup>41</sup> 'Quantum ad secundum quidam quod ens praedicat totam essentiam vel substantiam cuiuslibet de quo praedicatur eo quod nihil positivum est extra rationem entis, sicut nec species specialissima, quae quidem secundum Boethium in *Commento super Porphyrium* dicit totam essentiam individuorum, descendit in individua per differentias substantiales, propter quod ens praedicatur magis ad modum speciei specialissimae quam ad modum generis.... Confirmatur quia ut dicit Philosophus iv *Metaphysicae* "ens statim est quid quale quantum". Ergo per nullum positivum additum descendit in praedicamento' (V 56r).

<sup>42</sup> 'Sciendum quod conceptus univocus accipitur dupliciter. Uno modo accipitur conceptus univocus alicuius ex unitate et indifferentia eorum in quibus est commune et modi concipiendi. Et isto modo est univocatio proprie dicta.... Alio modo accipitur conceptus univocus tantummodo ex indifferentia modi concipiendi.... Hoc autem univocum non est universale reale, sed est commune tantum communitate rationis.... Accipiendo vero univocationem secundo modo, scilicet quae accipitur ex indifferentia modi concipiendi, dico quod ens est univocum Deo et creaturae' (1 *Sent.* d.3 nn.21-24 [ed. Azcona, 1.190:173-191:198]). The view that the proper and univocal concepts of being are only different manners of taking the same concept, rather than different concepts or formal objects, is not without textual support in Scotus. Early on, however, Antonius Andreas refutes this view which is given in terms very similar to those Peter of Navarre will adopt: 'Respondetur forte quod ens non habet communitatem aliquam realem sed solum quantum ad quandam <in>differentiam concipiendi. Cum ergo dicitur quod praedicatur in quid, non est intelligendum quod sit aliquid commune reale quod praedicatur in quid de pluribus, sed sub uno modo concipiendi

Navarre, being descends merely through 'concepts of reason' just as 'some man' descends into an individual man.<sup>43</sup> In effect, Peter is using a refined version of the species model, according to which being is seen to be related to its inferiors as a 'vague' or indeterminate individual is to determinate individuals.<sup>44</sup> Peter Thomae

continentur plures res, quarum quaelibet praedicatur de hoc et de illo seorsum, puta realitas Dei contenta sub modo concipiendi ens in communi praedicatur de Deo. Contra...' (Antonius Andreas, *QQ Metaph.* 1.1 [ed. Venice, 1473, fol. 3rb]). Peter of Navarre's position will later be appropriated by Peter of Aquila, who, like Navarre, will use it to reconcile the positions of Aquinas and Scotus: 'Sed ulterius restat hic videre qualis est ista univocatio entis. Et dicunt aliqui quod est realis realitate obiectiva. Sed hoc non credo esse verum, quia se totis distinctis realiter nihil est commune realiter. Sed Deus et creatura sunt huiusmodi.... Dico ergo quod univocatio entis non est realis, sed est accipienda ex indifferentia modi concipiendi.... Et ad hoc est notandum quod sicut potest esse duplex ratio in qua aliqua conveniunt, ita potest esse duplex univocatio. Nam aliqua conveniunt in ratione transcendenti, aliqua conveniunt in ratione praedicamentali. Ideo est quaedam univocatio transcendens et quaedam praedicamentalis. Et prima univocatio convenit enti, secunda non.... De quarto articulo, dico duas conclusiones. Prima quod univocatio entis, si ponitur realis, non est compossibilis cum analogia. Secunda quod univocatio entis, si ponitur per indifferentiam modi concipiendi, sicut est expositum in articulo praecedenti, est compossibilis cum analogia' (Peter of Aquila, 1 *Sent.* d.3 q.1 [ed. Speyer, 1480; rpt. Frankfurt, 1967, unfoliated]). The *aliqui* who holds that the concept of being is one *realitate obiectiva* is probably Alnwick (Dumont, p. 63.807-810). Barth has drawn attention to Peter of Aquila's innovation of a *univocatio transcendens* (Timothy Barth, 'Being, Univocity, and Analogy' in *John Duns Scotus, 1265-1965*, ed. John K. Ryan and Bernardine M. Bonansea [Washington, D. C., 1965], pp. 256-57). This, however, is certainly equivalent to Scotus' expression *universale transcendens* (*QQ Metaph.* 4.1 n.9 [Vivès 7.149a]) and Alnwick's *superunivocatio* (Dumont, p. 62.753). To what extent the univocally common concept of being could be called real continued to exercise the followers of Scotus.

<sup>43</sup> 'Ideo quidam alius doctor ponit tria: primum quod ens secundum aliam et aliam rationem realem dicitur de quolibet ente, licet sit univocum secundum modum concipiendi; secundum quod ens non contrahitur per aliquem conceptum realem, sed per conceptum rationis, sicut hoc commune quod est "aliquis homo" descendit in sua individua; tertium quod ens potest accipi uno modo universalissime ut distinguitur contra nihil vel contra ens rationis, et sic dicitur in quid de omnibus, quia illo modo se extendit ad quodlibet positivum vel negativum ex natura rei; alio modo accipitur ens pro illo quod primo occurrit intellectui, scilicet pro essentia, et illo modo non praedicatur in quid de propriis passionibus nec de ultimis differentiis, quamvis de ipsis dicatur in quid ens primo modo sumptum. Quod autem dicatur de ultimis differentiis, sic probatur: primo, quia omnis entitas [quiditativa] realis includit in sua ratione quiditativa ens; sed differentia individualis est entitas potissima; ergo etc. Secundo, quia si aliquid constituitur ex duobus quiditativis, in quolibet illorum includitur ens quiditativa; sed differentia individualis et conceptus speciei constituuntur quid ipsius individui; ergo etc.' (V 56r-v). This includes a verbatim quotation of Peter of Navarre, 1 *Sent.* d.3 n.31 (Azcona, 1.192:29-31).

<sup>44</sup> 'Alio modo accipitur conceptus univocus tantummodo ex indifferentia modi concipiendi. Exemplum: aliquis homo est individuum vagum, commune univocum omnibus individuis hominibus sub differentiis individualibus...' (1 *Sent.* d.3 n.22 [Azcona, 1.190:79-82]). Peter Thomae regards this as unsatisfactory as the species account: 'Sed instabit aliquis... quia individuum vagum contrahitur ad individua signata, non tamen per aliqua addita, ut dicunt alii doctores. ...non cogit, nam differentia individualis signati [-nata ms.], puta Petreitas, est extra formalem rationem individui vagi, nec illam formaliter includit. Contra: Petreitas includit aliquitatem quae videtur esse formalis ratio individui vagi. Individuum enim vagum non videtur dicere ultra conceptum speciei nisi aliquitatem [in aliquitate ms.], puta homo et aliquis homo. Ergo differentia individualis assignata includit formalem rationem individui vagi. Respondeo: nego illam primam, quia conceptus ultimae differentiae est

gives a lengthy rejection of Peter of Navarre's position on the grounds that being in all cases is contracted to something real. It thus cannot be contracted by mere concepts of reason.<sup>45</sup>

As for Alnwick's account, Peter rejects it on three points. First, Peter denies the whole basis of Alnwick's opinion, namely, that everything is essentially or quidditatively a being. Secondly, Alnwick's contention that species descend into individuals through no addition is false. Lastly, a genus more appropriately describes the universality of being than does a species.<sup>46</sup> Here Peter argues that the highest universal is closer to the more universal than to the least universal. But since the species is least universal, the universality of being is more aptly given as generic. As for the authority of Boethius that the species is the whole being of the individual, Peter answers that this is true only with regard to quidditative being. It does not, therefore, imply that the individual adds nothing to the species, but only that it adds nothing quidditative. Finally, Aristotle's text that being is immediately one of the categories means only that being descends into the categories before any other genera.<sup>47</sup> Here the qualification 'immediately' does not negate some contracting factor but intermediate genera.<sup>48</sup>

simpliciter simplex, et ideo Petreitas nullam rationem communiorum vel minus communem vel particularem includit' (V 56r). The idea of an indeterminate individual can be found in Scotus. See 1 *Ord.* d.17 n.214 'Adnotatio Duns Scoti' (Vat. 5.245) and Dumont, p. 18 note 56.

<sup>45</sup> 'Sed iste modus videtur dubius, primo quia ostensum fuit superius quod ens secundum quandam rationem realem dicitur de omnibus sub se contentis; secundo, quia si ens contrahitur per conceptum rationis, ergo conceptus rationis erit de quidditate termini contractionis [contradictionis ms.], quod videtur inconueniens, quia tunc Deus et creatura ad quae ens contrahitur etiam includeret ens rationis.... Praeterea ens contrahitur per finitum et infinitum. Ergo conceptus finiti et infiniti sunt conceptus rationis. Consequens non videtur, nam infinitas dicit modum intrinsecum perfectionis simpliciter, quod non videtur posse competere conceptui rationis. Confirmatur: conceptus finiti et infiniti, possibilis et necesse, sunt vere reales. Sed ens per istos contrahitur, ut postea dicitur. Ergo ens contrahitur per conceptus vere reales. Praeterea quod "aliquis homo" descendat ad sua individua per conceptum rationis non videtur, nam eius individua sunt vere res actu existens, puta hic homo singularis Petrus, etc. Sed contrahibile et contractum includuntur quidditative in termino contractionis [contradictionis ms.]. Ergo aliquis conceptus rationis includetur quidditative in ipsis rebus singularibus, quod videtur oppositum in adiecto' (*De ente* q.14 [V 56v]).

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Scotus, *QQ Metaph.* 4.1 n.9 (Vivès 7.150a-b) and *QQ De an.* q.21 n.13 (Vivès 3.618b).

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Scotus, *QQ Metaph.* 4.1 n.3 (Vivès 7.147a).

<sup>48</sup> 'Quantum ad secundum dicunt quidam quod ens praedicat totam essentiam vel substantiam cuiuslibet de quo praedicatur, eo quod nihil positivum est extra rationem entis, sicut nec species specialissima, quae quidem secundum Boethium in *Commento super Porphyrium* dicit totam essentiam individuorum, descendit in individua per differentias substantiales, propter quod ens praedicatur magis ad modum speciei specialissimae quam ad modum generis.... Confirmatur quia ut dicit Philosophus VIII *Metaphysicae* "ens statim est quid quale quantum". Ergo per nullum positivum additum descendit in praedicamento. Sed ista positio videtur deficere. Primo in fundamento < quia > ostensum est in praecedentibus quod aliquid est extra rationem entis seu ipsum ens quidditative non includens. Secundo, quia ponit speciem non descendere ad individua per aliquas differentias, quod falsum est, et nunc suppono. Tertio in hoc ponitur ens magis praedicari ad modum speciei

Like Anfredus before him, then, Peter recognizes that Alnwick cannot use Boethius' text in a Scotistic framework to argue that being descends without addition. At best it can only be used to show that being descends through no *quidditative* addition. Peter, more explicitly than Anfredus, points out that the way Alnwick has construed Boethius contradicts Scotus' own theory of individuation according to which the individual difference does add something positive to the species. As for Peter's argument that the universality of being is closer to that of a genus than a species, some basis for this can be found in Scotus.<sup>49</sup> In fact, however, Peter has misunderstood what for Scotus is the true gauge of universality. According to Peter, the genus is more universal because more falls under it than under a species. But for Scotus it is clear that the extent of a universal is governed by what is above it, not by what is below it.<sup>50</sup>

Peter outlines his own position in a series of six conclusions in which he holds that being is immediately contracted not by differences properly speaking but by intrinsic modes.<sup>51</sup> He, like Anfredus, reverts to Scotus' preferred position, although it is not clear that Peter's notion of intrinsic mode corresponds exactly with Scotus'

specialissimae quam ad modum generis, nam ens praedicatur in quid de pluribus differentibus specie in eo quod quid et non solum de differentibus solum numero. Ergo magis assimilatur in praedicando generi quam speciei. Confirmatur, tum quia problema [probabile ms.] de ente reducitur ad problema [probabile ms.] de genere, ut dicit Commentator; tum quia summe commune minus videtur < assimilari > in modo universalitatis infimo communi quam communiori; ens autem est summe commune, species infimum commune, genus vero communius; ergo ens minus assimilatur speciei specialissimae in modo universalitatis quam generi. Ad illud Boethii, concedo cum ipso quod species dicit totam quidditatem individuorum, ita quod nihil addit individuum supra speciem ad quidditatem pertinens, differentiae enim individuales ad quidditatem non pertinent. Ad illud Philosophi, ideo illud dicit quia [quod ms.] illa praedicamenta sunt immediate partes subiectivi entis creati, ita quod inter ipsas et ens non mediat aliqua pars subiectiva, sicut inter substantiam et suas species specialissimas mediant aliae partes subiectivae, scilicet genera subalterna. Et ideo substantia non statim est quaelibet species specialissima sub se contenta. Ly igitur "statim" privat mediationem partis subiectivae, sed non mediationem contracti, seu tollit "medium" non "medium quo" (De ente q.14 [V 56r]).

<sup>49</sup> 'Aliter potest dici, quod quantum ad divisionem Porphyrii, forte ens est genus, et unum proprium, sed non quantum ad hoc quod est dicere partem speciei, ita quod determinetur per differentiam' (QQ Metaph. 4.1 n.9 [Vivès 7.150a-b]); 'Vel potest dici sustinendo, quod sit genus, vel quasi genus secundum Avicennam, quod descendit in inferiora per addita, quae sunt etiam idem realiter, non tamen formaliter' (QQ De an. q.21 n.13 [Vivès 3.618b]).

<sup>50</sup> Thus, according to Scotus, something is transcendental not because everything is below it, but because nothing is above it. See 1 Ord. d.8 n.114 (Vat. 4.206).

<sup>51</sup> 'Ideo procedo aliter. Sit haec prima conclusio: conceptus entis est contrahibilis...' (V 56v); 'Secunda conclusio: impossibile est conceptum entis contrahi per aliquid ipsum ens quidditative includens...' (V 57r); 'Conclusio tertia: conceptus entis non est contrahibilis immediate contractione praedicamentali...' (ibid.); 'Quarta conclusio: impossibile est ens immediate contrahi per differentias proprie sumptas. Hanc probat Aureolus...' (ibid.); 'Quinta conclusio: ens immediate contrahitur per aliquos modos intrinsecos...' (V 57v); 'Sexta conclusio: ens potest contrahi [im]mediate per differentias proprie sumptas...' (ibid.).

own.<sup>52</sup> Peter nevertheless remains sensitive to the texts from Scotus' *QQ Metaph.* 4.1 which Alnwick has exploited for his opposing view that being descends without addition. In the course of arguing his second conclusion, namely, that being is not contracted by anything essentially containing being, which is the opposite of Alnwick's position, Peter explicitly raises as an objection the exact text from Scotus' *QQ Metaph.* 4.1 used by Alnwick. It should be noted that the text below comes from the middle of a long section of Scotus' *QQ Metaph.* 4.1 marked 'extra' in the Wadding-Vivès edition. Peter thus establishes its authenticity:

Perhaps you will say, just as Scotus says [in his question] on 4 *Metaph.*, that 'beings wholly differ and wholly agree, because "being" does not signify a part of their perfection but the whole [of it], just as individuals wholly agree and wholly differ, because "species" signifies the whole being of individuals.'<sup>53</sup>

Peter replies that the claim 'beings wholly agree and wholly differ' is a contradiction since the expression 'wholly differ' (*se totis differunt*) is equivalent to 'totally diverse' (*primo diversa*). But total diversity excludes any agreement, much less total agreement. Does this mean that Peter understood Scotus to contradict himself? Does Peter see this text from Scotus' *QQ Metaph.* 4.1 as reconcilable with the Subtle Doctor's doctrine of individuation and intrinsic modes as contained in the *Ordinatio*? Here is Peter's precious reply:

Furthermore, the first response is a weakening of Scotus' teaching in the matter of individuation. Therefore, he who relates the opinions of Scotus should beware of those things and several others which there Scotus says in a *disputational manner*.<sup>54</sup>

<sup>52</sup> See Bridges, *Identity and Distinction*, pp. 125-26 and 129-32 where it appears that for Peter Thomae intrinsic modes have their own *proper* concepts. Scotus is not traditionally seen to hold this since intrinsic modes have no formal content of their own. See Dumont, p. 14 note 43.

<sup>53</sup> The text of Scotus quoted by Peter comes verbatim from *QQ Metaph.* 4.1 'Extra' (Vivès 7.149a): 'Hic dico, quod se totis conveniunt et se totis differunt, quia ens non dicit partem perfectionis ipsorum, sed totam, sicut individua se totis conveniunt et differunt, quia species dicit totum esse individuorum.' Compare Peter's version in the next note.

<sup>54</sup> Supplied is Peter's entire discussion so as to establish that the antecedent of '*prima responsio*' is in fact the objection drawn from Scotus' *QQ Metaph.* 4.1. We here follow W: 'Conclusio secunda: impossibile est conceptum entis contrahi per aliquid ipsum ens quiditative includens.... Dices forte, sicut dicit Scotus *Super IV Metaph.*, quod "entia se totis differunt et se totis conveniunt, quia ens non dicit partem perfectionis eorum, sed totum, sicut individua se totis conveniunt et se totis differunt, quia species dicit totum esse individuorum". Contra: aliqua simul esse primo diversa et non esse primo diversa secundum eundem conceptum est contradictio evidens. Sed aliqua se totis differre et se totis convenire est ipsa inter se esse primo diversa et ipsa inter se non esse primo diversa. Ergo aliqua se totis differre et se totis convenire est contradictio manifesta. Maior est evidens ex terminis. Minor patet, nam in hoc quod ponuntur se totis distincta, ponuntur "aliquid idem non entia", et per consequens primo diversa, ut patet ex descriptione diversorum v *Metaphysicae*. In hoc vero quod ponuntur se totis convenire, ponuntur "aliquid", immo totum, "idem entia", et per consequens ponuntur non esse primo diversa. Confirmatur: quae se totis conveniunt in nullo penitus differunt. Sed omnia entia se totis conveniunt per te. Ergo in nullo differunt, et per consequens sunt penitus

According to Peter Thomae, then, the text from Scotus' *QQ Metaph.* 4.1 which Alnwick has exploited is not faithful to Scotus' true doctrine of individuation. Peter's explanation of this inconsistency is that in this passage of *QQ Metaph.* 4.1, as well as in several others in that question, Scotus speaks only *collative*.<sup>55</sup> That is, Scotus proceeds in this text in an argumentative fashion, examining various sides without necessarily claiming one as his own. Peter does not specify the other passages in *QQ Metaph.* 4.1 where he takes Scotus to be speaking *collative*, but recent scholarship has contested the question because of its putative denial of univocity.<sup>56</sup> Before Peter's remarks about *QQ Metaph.* 4.1 are dismissed as a mere saving of his master, recall that he attests to having access to writings in Scotus' own hand and to *cedullae* containing Scotus' revisions.<sup>57</sup>

William of Alnwick appears to have been the first to integrate into a single account of univocity Scotus' *QQ Metaph.* 4.1, which holds that being descends of

et totaliter unum et idem, et redibit error Parmenidis et Melissi. Diceres [dicens *VW*] quod omnia sunt unum et idem in universali, non tamen in particulari. Contra: aut particularuntur per rationem quiditativam entis aut per aliqua alia. Si primum, stabunt rationes praedictae < in > precedente < questione >. Si secundum, illa ratio vel est positiva, et tunc habetur propositum, vel pure negativa, quod esse non potest, quia illa nec est ratio distinguendi nec non distinguendi; tum quia entia solis negationibus formaliter distinguuntur; tum quia tunc negatio quiditativa includeret < ur > in entibus, cum per illam ponantur quiditative distinguere; tum quia propria negatio consequeretur propriam confirmationem; si ergo entia distinguuntur per proprias negationes, oporteret dare proprias rationes positivas super quibus illae propriae negationes fundentur; tunc etiam habetur propositum. Praeterea, prima responsio est enervativa doctrinae Scoti in materia de individuatione, et ideo illa et plura alia quae ibi collative [corr. ex copulative *N*: collective *V*] dicit Scotus cavere debet relator opinionum ipsius' (*De ente* q. 14 [V 56r-v; W 42ra-b; N 148v, p. 70]). The '*prima responsio*' constitutes the first objection Alnwick's position would pose to Peter's second conclusion. After Peter's replies, Alnwick's second response follows, which is an attempt to answer Peter's charge that Alnwick's first response lapses into the monism of Parmenides and Melissus. That this is a second response is not clear in V and W which read *dicens* for *diceres*, making it appear as though it is a continuation of Peter's argument to Alnwick's first response rather than a rebuttal of it. Thus, the referent of '*ibi collative dicit Scotus*' is *QQ Metaph.* 4.1.

<sup>55</sup> The adjective *collativus* is usually used in scholastic contexts to denote a discursive power or act. Scotus himself uses the term as a synonym for *comparativus* to indicate the ability of the intellect, will, and imagination to compare their objects as opposed to the senses which merely apprehend: 'Certum est enim quod voluntas est talis potentia comparativa et collativa, et imaginativa similiter, ita bene sicut potentia intellectiva...' (1 *Ord.* d. 45 n. 11 [Vat. 6.375]). Thus to proceed *collative* would mean to compare different views without necessarily adopting one's own. Similarly, in a university context, a *collatio* is a *disputatio*, so that to speak *collative* is to proceed as though in a collation or disputation, the function of which was to take up opposing views. See Little-Pelster, *Oxford Theology*, pp. 53-56.

<sup>56</sup> On the controversy, see Allan B. Wolter, *The Transcendentals and Their Function in the Metaphysics of Duns Scotus* (St. Bonaventure, N. Y., 1946), pp. 45-48 and Steven P. Marrone, 'The Notion of Univocity in Duns Scotus's Early Works', *Franciscan Studies* 43 (1983) 347-95. Wolter maintains that Scotus does not deny univocity in this question. Professor Marrone argues that, when read against the background of Scotus' logical treatises, *QQ Metaph.* 4.1 remains inconclusive on univocity.

<sup>57</sup> See Azcona, 'Escotismo en España', 14-15.

itself through no addition in the manner of a species, and Scotus' *Ordinatio* where being is seen to be contracted by intrinsic modes. Like similar attempts made after him by Landolf Caracciolo and Francis of Meyronnes, Alnwick could not integrate these two texts of Scotus without departing from his master's outline of individuation, according to which species descend through the addition of some reality. Alnwick's approach was to revert to Henry of Ghent's position that individuation takes place through negation alone, while Landolf Caracciolo and Francis of Meyronnes turned the principle of individuation into an intrinsic mode. As far as can be discovered, Anfredus Gonteri and Peter Thomae were the first to recognize that projects such as Alnwick's could not remain faithful to Scotus' theory of individuation despite being based on Scotus' own texts. Peter Thomae went further and offered an explanation for the inconsistency in Scotus' texts themselves. According to Peter, Scotus contradicts his own doctrine of individuation in *QQ Metaph.* 4.1 because there Scotus proceeds only by comparing various views without determining his own. As we shall ultimately see, this did not stop Peter from appropriating part of *QQ Metaph.* 4.1 into his account of univocity.

### B. *Being and Difference*

The doctrinal pressure that brought Alnwick to supplement Scotus' teaching on univocity in the *Ordinatio* with the species account from *QQ Metaph.* 4.1 came precisely from his position that being is essentially or formally included in all its inferiors, including ultimate differences. From *QQ Metaph.* 4.1 Alnwick learned that if being is essentially predicated of all things, then it must descend like a species without addition.<sup>58</sup> But if *QQ Metaph.* 4.1 provided Alnwick with his solutions, it also provided his critics with countervailing arguments. In the same text Scotus goes on to note that the species model cannot by itself obviate the problem of redundancy.<sup>59</sup> It is this problem, according to Peter Thomae, that proves fatal to Alnwick's position against Scotus. In fact, in Peter's view, it proves fatal even to the usual interpretation of Scotus' own position.

In *De ente* q.13, Peter examines and rejects in detail Alnwick's critique of Scotus' theory on the predication of being. Peter's ultimate objection seems to be that Alnwick reduces all definitions to fallacies of redundancy (*nugatio*).<sup>60</sup> Both

<sup>58</sup> 'Ad istud argumentum sunt quatuor responsiones.... Quarta quod est commune cuicumque quocumque modo concepto, et hoc tam formaliter quam per identitatem, sed est tale commune quod descendit inferius per nihil additum, sed dicit totum illud quod dicit inferius' (*QQ Metaph.* 4.1 n.10 [Vivès 7.151a]).

<sup>59</sup> 'Quarta responsio, nullo modo cavet nugationem, quandocumque aliquid additur enti, vel aliquid alteri, quia in utroque clauditur formaliter idem conceptus entis, cavet tamen processum in infinitum, quia non per aliquid aliud additum descendit' (ibid. [Vivès 7.150b]).

<sup>60</sup> Cf. Aristotle, *SE* 31 (181b25-183a27). Peter of Spain gave the standard definition of *nugatio*: 'Nugatio est eiusdem et ex eadem parte inutilis repetitio, ut "homo homo currit" vel "homo



Scotus and Alnwick were concerned with this problem. Alnwick simply repeats Scotus' formulation of the objection. Redundancy occurs when the same thing is needlessly expressed twice. But if being is essentially included in every concept, then it will be found twice in every definition, once in the genus and again in the difference.<sup>61</sup> Scotus had of course recognized that this objection applied in a limited way to his position since he admitted that at least some differences essentially include being. He attempted to avoid redundancy by means of the following rule: 'when two things inferior to some common third thing are so related that one denominates the other, that common thing taken determinately denominates itself.' By this obscure reply Scotus means that when one thing denominates or qualifies another, such as difference and genus, redundancy is avoided because the one does not repeat but expresses in a denominative fashion the common feature of the other. For example, there is no redundancy in 'rational animal' because, although 'animal' essentially contains being, 'rational' merely expresses being denominatively. 'Rational' thus does not repeat the being contained in 'animal' but only denominates it. By contrast, 'rationality animal' is redundant since both essentially or quidditatively contain being.<sup>62</sup>

Peter finds Scotus' above reply less than convincing. According to Peter, Scotus' only argument for his rule is based upon the example of 'rational', which is itself at issue.<sup>63</sup> That is, it is a disputed point whether or not 'rational' is an ultimate difference. Consequently it is not clear whether Scotus' rule works or whether redundancy has been avoided simply because 'rational', as an ultimate difference, does not contain being in the first place. Peter thinks the insufficiency of Scotus' attempt to eliminate redundancy led Alnwick, in whose scheme the problem is even more acute, to develop two solutions of his own.<sup>64</sup>

Alnwick's first solution is that redundancy occurs only in a definition when the same concept is actually and needlessly expressed twice insofar as it pertains to the definition. But being neither enters nor pertains to the definition of any nature since it is a transcendental. His second solution, which in fact derives from Scotus' above reply in the *Ordinatio*, is to define redundancy as the repetition of the same concept according to the same mode (*modus*). Thus 'white color' is not redundant, even though 'color' is present twice, since 'color' is a quidditative mode and 'white'

rationalis". Dico autem "ex eadem parte", quia si ponatur in diversis partibus idem, non est nugatio, ut "homo est homo" vel "homo est rationalis" ( *Tractatus Called Afterwards Summule logicales*, ed. L. M. de Rijk [Assen, 1972], p. 94.29-32).

<sup>61</sup> Dumont, p. 36.36-40. Cf. Scotus, 1 *Ord.* d.3 n.161 (Vat. 3.99); *QQ Metaph.* 4.1 n.11 (Vivès 7.152a).

<sup>62</sup> 1 *Ord.* d.3 n.161 (Vat. 3.99-100).

<sup>63</sup> Below, II. 227-239. Cf. '... ita haec est in quid "rationalitas est ens", si rationalitas sit talis differentia' (Scotus, 1 *Ord.* d.3 n.159 [Vat. 3.97]).

<sup>64</sup> Below, II. 240-246, 275-288.

a qualitative or denominative mode. By contrast, 'whiteness color' is redundant since 'color' is present in both quidditatively. Consequently, in definition there is no redundancy, even though being occurs twice, since genus is a being in a quidditative mode and difference a being in a denominative mode.<sup>65</sup>

Peter rejects both solutions. The first fails because Alnwick holds that being signifies the entire essence of its inferiors. It must therefore signify the entire essence of anything entering a definition. But it is absurd that being, which signifies the entire essence of everything in the definition, should itself not enter the definition.<sup>66</sup>

Peter argues that Alnwick's second solution falls prey to a similar inconsistency. There are only three modes available to remove redundancy: grammatical, logical, or real. But saying the same thing twice while varying only the grammatical mode does not eliminate redundancy. For example, *anthropos homo* is redundant even though *homo* and *anthropos* differ grammatically, that is, have different etymologies. *Homo* derives from *humus* and *anthropos* from *arbor conversa*.<sup>67</sup> Nor does a variation in the logical mode of conception remove redundancy from what occurs twice, for *humanitas homo* is redundant even though the first is an abstract concept and the second concrete. It remains, then, that only a diversity in modes which are in some way real (*aliquoliter ex natura rei*), and not merely grammatical or conceptual, can avoid redundancy. But if this is the case, then Alnwick's claim is that redundancy in definition is avoided because differences are beings according to a qualitative or denominative mode. This, however, contradicts his prior claim that all differences are beings quidditatively.<sup>68</sup>

The burden to Peter's involved rebuttals is to show that Alnwick's position slips into an infinite redundancy that reduces all definitions to trivial repetitions of the single concept of being. In Peter's view, Alnwick's position effectively eliminates all differences. In a surprising extension of this objection, Peter rejects even Scotus' attempt to avoid the limited redundancy presented by his position that at least some differences essentially include being. As we shall presently see, the only way Peter could find to avoid redundancy was to eliminate being not just from some but from *all* differences. What is even more surprising is that Peter thinks that this is in fact Scotus' own true position on the relation of being to difference.

<sup>65</sup> Dumont, p. 72.1067-92.

<sup>66</sup> Below, II. 247-251.

<sup>67</sup> Cf. 'Homo dictus, quia ex humo est factus. ... Graeci autem hominem appellaverunt, eo quod sursum spectet sublevatus ab humo ad contemplationem artificis sui. Quod Ovidius poeta designat, cum dicit (*Met.* 1.84) "Pronaque cum spectant animalia cetera terram/ os homini sublime dedit caelumque videre/ iussit, et erectos ad sidera tollere vultus"' (Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae* 11.1). That is, man is a tree because unlike all other animals he is erect. He is an 'inverted' tree because his 'mouth' or face, from which he draws nourishment, is not in the ground but upturned towards the heavens. *Conversa* is apparently translating *anthropos*, that is, *ana* – *tropos*.

<sup>68</sup> Below, II. 289-309.

## III

## PETER THOMAE AND DUNS SCOTUS

Peter knew that the chief objection to his own position on the predication of being would be that it did not agree with Scotus' own. He accordingly lays out exactly what Scotus says on the matter, gathered, as Peter himself testifies, from both the first and second books of Scotus' *Sentences*. Peter reduces Scotus' position to a series of five textual *dicta*. (1) : An ultimate difference is that which has no further difference, and consequently does not have a concept resolvable into quidditative and qualitative parts. Rather, the concept of an ultimate difference is purely qualitative. (2) : There is a distinction in differences. One is taken from an ultimate essential part which is itself a thing (*res*) or nature (*natura*) distinct from the nature from which the concept of genus is taken, such as would be the case in a plurality of forms. A second difference is taken from the ultimate reality or formality (*realitas seu formalitas*) of a thing or nature. Here the distinction between genus and difference is not one of two things (*res et res*) but of two formally distinct realities (*realitates*) within the same thing. (3) : No difference of the first type is ultimate, since it contains several formally distinct realities. It accordingly does not have an irreducibly simple concept. The second type of difference is ultimate, for what is taken from the ultimate reality of a nature is always irreducibly simple. (4-5): Being can be predicated formally or *in quid* of the first type of difference, even taken abstractly, but not of the second.<sup>69</sup>

There are three current interpretations, according to Peter, of these texts of Scotus. The first, which doubtless belongs to Peter of Navarre, says that the only ultimate differences at issue are the individuating differences.<sup>70</sup> Peter Thomae, however, rejects this as going expressly against the texts of Scotus. Apparently Peter has in mind Scotus' treatise of individuation in 2 *Ordinatio* where ultimate specific differences are explicitly mentioned.<sup>71</sup> The second opinion, held by one who follows Scotus in all matters, is that being is a *quid* but not predicated *in quid* of all differences. This is perhaps Antonius Andreas, who claimed to follow Scotus in all matters.<sup>72</sup> Peter summarily dismisses this as contradicting Scotus' express

<sup>69</sup> Below, II. 96-126 and references to Scotus given there.

<sup>70</sup> 'Quantum ad differentias ultimas, scilicet individuales, videtur aliquibus quod ens non sit eis commune univocum' (Peter of Navarre, 1 *Sent.* d.3 n.34 [ed. Azcona, 1.193:50-51]).

<sup>71</sup> '... tamen ultima differentia specifica est primo diversa ab alia...' (2 *Ord.* d.3 n.183 [Vat. 7.481]); cf. 2 *Lect.* d.3 n.172 (Vat. 18.283).

<sup>72</sup> Andreas gives the following notation at the end of his *Expositio in libros Metaphysicorum* printed under the name of Scotus in the Wadding-Vivès text: '...secutus sum doctrinam illius subtilissimi et excellentissimi Doctoris... scilicet Magistri Joannis Duns Scotus... pes meus eius vestigia secutus est...' (Vivès 6.600). In his *Quaestiones in Metaphysicam* Andreas says that while ultimate differences are not formally beings, they are nevertheless beings essentially and really: '...dico

view that concepts of ultimate differences are irreducibly simple. Finally, a third opinion, which nearly everyone follows, is that according to Scotus being is predicated *in quid* of mediate but not of ultimate specific differences.<sup>73</sup> As we shall presently see, however, Peter does not think Scotus' own principles can support such an interpretation.

After this careful review of Scotus' texts and their various interpretations, Peter advances his own position. Peter contradicts the views of both Alnwick and Aureoli that being is predicated *in quid* of all differences and maintains instead that it is so predicated of none.<sup>74</sup> Furthermore, Peter holds that this is Scotus' own true position on the matter, despite nearly universal agreement to the contrary. Peter sets out his reasoning in a series of four conclusions:<sup>75</sup>

- C<sub>1</sub>: The proper concept of a difference is qualitative.
- C<sub>2</sub>: An inferior difference does not quidditatively include a superior difference.
- C<sub>3</sub>: The proper concept of a difference is irreducibly simple.
- C<sub>4</sub>: Being is predicated *in quid* of no difference.

The first conclusion is evident from the definition of a difference as that which determines or qualifies.<sup>76</sup> The second follows because otherwise the inferior difference would be a species, for it would contain something properly quidditative and something qualitative.<sup>77</sup> The heaviest burden of proof clearly occurs in the

quod non includunt ens formaliter, sicut nec passionis entis nec ultimae differentiae.... Cum ergo arguitur quod non sunt entia, dicendum quod non sunt entia formaliter, sunt tamen entia realiter et essentialiter' (*QQ Metaph.* 4.1 [ed. 1473, fol. 28ra]). If this is the text Peter has in mind, then the same criticism holds of Scotus' *QQ Metaph.* which Andreas is here following: '...et tamen ipsa differentia per identitatem est essentialiter ens, licet non formali praedicatione...' (Scotus, *QQ Metaph.* 4.1 n.7 'Extra' [Vivès 7.149a]).

<sup>73</sup> Anfredus Gonteri, for example, explicitly holds this view: 'Ita in proposito de differentia ultima et media, quia licet utraque sit ens, non omni eodem modo, quia differentia ultima sumpta ab ultima realitate rei dicens conceptum simpliciter simplicem non includit ens per se primo modo. Differentia autem media includit ens per se, quia non sumitur ab ultima realitate formae sed ab ultima forma, quae includit ens per se, sicut rationale...' (1 *Sent.* d.3 q.4 [Wrocław 195 I.F.184, fol. 109vb]). It is also found in the anonymous Scotist of Vat. lat. 869 who attacks Alnwick's position: 'Item ad hoc idem adducunt aliqui talem rationem: si conceptus entis includeretur quidditative in conceptu generis et ultimae differentiae, sequitur quod omnis definitio esset nugatoria.... Sed ista aequae contra me sicut contra illos [sc. Alnwick] qui dicunt conceptum entis includi in quid in omni [communi ms.] conceptu posteriori, licet ego non ponam conceptum entis includi quidditative in conceptu sumpto <ab> ultimo gradu in forma quem voco conceptum ultimae differentiae. In hoc discordo ab eis. Tamen pono conceptum entis includi quidditative in conceptu differentiarum intermediarum' (*Quaestiones ordinariae de transcendentibus conceptibus* q.2 [Vat. lat. 869, fol. 40rb]).

<sup>74</sup> Peter reports and attacks Aureoli's position at length, quoting verbatim from his *Scriptum*. See below, II. 545-788 and sources cited in the apparatus. We are not directly concerned with Aureoli here. For Aureoli's doctrine on univocity, see Brown, 'Unity of the Concept of Being', 135-50.

<sup>75</sup> For these four conclusions, see below II. 141-142, 159, 204, and 424.

<sup>76</sup> Below, II. 141-146.

<sup>77</sup> Below, II. 159-163. On whether the inferior difference contains the superior, see Scotus, *QQ Metaph.* 7.17 (Vivès 7.449a-52a); 4 *Ord.* d.11 q.3 nn.47-49 (Vivès 17.429b-31b).

justification of the third conclusion, for it appears to contradict Scotus' position, as summarized by Peter himself, that there are some differences without irreducibly simple concepts. In Scotistic terms, Peter's third conclusion reduces every difference to an ultimate difference. Peter can easily establish part of the conclusion by showing that the concept of a difference can include no other categorical notion. A difference can include neither the concept of genus nor of species since it qualifies the first and constitutes the second. From the third conclusion, it cannot include another difference. All that remains is to show that the concept of a difference cannot include any transcendental notion, such as being, which is, of course, the main issue.<sup>78</sup>

Peter gives three arguments to prove this second part of the conclusion. The first and main argument, which we have already examined, is that if differences quidditatively included being, then definitions would be trivial. This holds both for Alnwick's extreme position that all differences are formally being as well as for Scotus' moderate position that only certain kinds of differences are. As we have also seen, Peter rejects the attempts of both Scotus and Alnwick to avoid redundancy. The second argument is drawn from the definition of a difference. The formal nature of a difference (*formalis ratio differentiae*) is to be the precise cause of things differing (*praecisa ratio differendi*). Thus the proper concept of a difference will be the concept of the precise cause of things differing. Such a concept, however, cannot include any other concept (*simpliciter non includens*); otherwise it would include the concept of something common and thus not be a proper concept of the precise cause of things differing. But if it includes no other concept, it is irreducibly simple.<sup>79</sup> Finally, Peter's third argument is an extension of Scotus' own reasoning against infinite regress. Differences do not themselves differ but are the precise cause or reason why things differ, for otherwise there would be an infinite regress in differences. But whatever has anything in common is not the cause of differing but differs itself. Thus no two differences can include anything common and so are wholly diverse. They thus have irreducibly simple concepts.<sup>80</sup> The point to these last two proofs is that a difference, taken precisely as difference, cannot be conceived as anything common. Thus a difference can only be grasped precisely as such in an irreducibly simple concept.

The fourth conclusion follows directly from the third, since whatever has an irreducibly simple concept cannot quidditatively include being.<sup>81</sup> At this point, Peter fully contradicts the common reading of Scotus on the relation of being to difference. He does not fail to raise the inevitable objection.

<sup>78</sup> Below, II. 204-216.

<sup>79</sup> Below, II. 310-317.

<sup>80</sup> Below, II. 318-327.

<sup>81</sup> Cf. Scotus, 1 *Ord.* d.3 n.150 (Vat. 3.92-93).

Objection: you are not speaking as a Scotist, for Scotus only denies that being is predicated of ultimate differences.<sup>82</sup>

In response, Peter first lays out exactly what the texts of Scotus say on the issue. First, Scotus explicitly says that being is not predicated *in quid* of ultimate differences. Secondly, he expressly says that being is predicated *in quid* of differences taken from an essential part which is a nature other than the nature from which the genus is taken. Peter claims, however, that this is not Scotus' personal view, but is merely assumed for the sake of discussion. Finally, Peter says that he has read no passage in Scotus which explicitly states that being is predicated *in quid* of mediate differences, although this is commonly imputed to Scotus.<sup>83</sup>

Given these textual indications, Peter proposes to show first that on Scotus' own principles being is not predicated *in quid* of mediate differences and secondly that Scotus does not contradict himself on this matter. As for the first task, Peter again argues that, just as Scotus reasons there is an infinite regress in conceptual analysis unless ultimate differences are irreducibly simple, so too with mediate differences.<sup>84</sup> The obvious objection, of course, is that Scotus himself says in his argument that the process of analysis ends with the concepts of being and ultimate difference, not with mediate differences.<sup>85</sup> To this Peter replies that whatever is capable of analysis must quidditatively contain that into which it is resolvable. But mediate differences do not quidditatively contain ultimate differences and so cannot be resolved into them.<sup>86</sup> Furthermore, Scotus himself says that the division of quidditative being is exhausted by uncreated being, the categories, and the essential parts of the categories.<sup>87</sup> But if mediate differences are quidditative beings, then they are either categories or essential parts of categories, both of which are false. If it is objected that mediate differences are included in the quidditative division of being because they are essential parts of species located under the categories, Peter would deny that this is sufficient. Ultimate differences are essential parts of species, yet, on the common reading of Scotus, they do not quidditatively include being.<sup>88</sup>

<sup>82</sup> Below, II. 431-432.

<sup>83</sup> See below, II. 433-442, 465-469, 470-475 and the texts of Scotus cited in the *apparatus fontium*.

<sup>84</sup> Below, II. 476-479.

<sup>85</sup> Below, II. 480-481. Cf. '...ita quod resolutio stet ad conceptus simpliciter simplices.... Ille conceptus tantum determinabilis est conceptus entis, et determinans tantum est conceptus ultimae differentiae' (1 *Ord.* d.3 n.133 [Wat. 3.82-83]).

<sup>86</sup> Below, II. 482-484.

<sup>87</sup> Below, II. 484-486. Cf. '...ens videtur sufficienter dividi tamquam in illa quae includunt ipsum quidditative in ens increatum et in decem genera, et in partes essentielles decem generum; saltem non videtur habere plura dividentia quidditative, quidquid sit de istis' (1 *Ord.* d.3 n.135 [Wat. 3.84]).

<sup>88</sup> Below, II. 486-499.

Finally, Peter seals his case by quoting a passage from Scotus' *QQ Metaph.* 7.17 which says that two differences have nothing common predicated of them *in quid*: 'Unde duae differentiae nihil habent commune praedicatum de eis in quid per se primo modo.'<sup>89</sup> Peter concludes that, 'These are the words of Scotus and none more clear than these can be stated for our position.'<sup>90</sup>

To establish his second point, namely, that Scotus does not contradict himself by in fact holding that every difference is ultimate, Peter distinguishes between two equivocal senses of 'ultimate'. In one sense, it means 'irresolvable' and in another 'final'. According to the first meaning, every difference and every reality from which a difference is taken are ultimate. In the second sense, only the differences of the most specific species and individuals are ultimate, for they are the final differences in their order. Thus mediate differences are not ultimate only in the sense that, in the scheme of the Porphyrian tree, they fall 'between' the primary differences of the categories and the final differences which constitute the last species or the individual. It is thus in this latter sense that Scotus speaks of only certain differences being ultimate.<sup>91</sup>

Although Peter has presented a consistent picture of how Scotus could be interpreted to hold that no difference can include being quidditatively, he must still confront the textual basis in Scotus for the common opinion to the contrary. The case for the common reading is built on two texts. In the first, as Peter himself reports in his summary, Scotus distinguishes between two types of difference and says that one type includes being and the other does not.<sup>92</sup> In the second, which is the occasion for the above distinction in differences, Scotus says that being is not a genus because of its greater community. This is evident, argues Scotus, because being is predicated quidditatively of some differences while a genus is so predicated of none.<sup>93</sup>

<sup>89</sup> The entire text from Scotus is as follows: 'Et similiter omnis differentia, quae est solum differentia, se tota est diversa, et omnis talis est praedicatum primum, ita quod non sit praedicatum, quod sit de intellectu alicuius differentiae, quod sit prius aliqua differentia. Unde differentiae duae nihil habent commune praedicatum de eis in quid per se primo modo' (*QQ Metaph.* 7.17 n.3 [Vivès 7.451b]).

<sup>90</sup> Below, II. 499-504.

<sup>91</sup> Below, II. 513-520. Cf. 'Ad secundum, dico quod primo diversa sunt diversa, scilicet primo per differentias primas et ultimas, et de talibus non dicitur ens quidditative, sed denominative; et de aliis differentis dicitur quidditative... tales sunt differentiae interpositae inter primam et ultimam speciem, quae includunt duos conceptus, scilicet quid et quale' (Scotus, *Collatio* [ed. Harris, 2.373]); Honnefelder, *Ens in quantum ens*, pp. 318-21; Dumont, p. 20 note 63.

<sup>92</sup> Below, II. 101-111, 465-469. Cf. Scotus, 1 *Ord.* d.3 n.159 (Vat. 3.97-98).

<sup>93</sup> Below, II. 473-475. Cf. 'Removet [sc. Aristoteles] enim ab ente rationem generis, non propter aequivocationem... sed removet rationem generis ab ente propter nimiam communitatem, quia videlicet praedicatur primo modo per se de differentia, et per hoc posset concludi quod ens non sit genus' (1 *Ord.* d.3 n.158 [Vat. 3.96-97]).

To the first text, Peter repeats his contention that this is not Scotus' own view, but is merely entertained by him hypothetically. According to Peter, Scotus himself holds that genus and difference are not taken from two different natures, but from two formally distinct realities in the same nature. Although textually the *Ordinatio* could be construed to support Peter's reading, nowhere in these discussions does Scotus limit specific differences to those taken from a reality formally distinct from that of the genus.<sup>94</sup> The second text, however, proves more problematic, and it is, accordingly, at this point that Peter certainly goes beyond his Doctor.

In the second text Scotus says that being is not a genus because it is predicated *in quid* of some differences, while a genus is not. This, like the previous text which occasioned it, is also dismissed by Peter as not giving Scotus' personal view. According to Peter, Scotus is here merely explaining the transgeneric community of being given the assumption of the alleged distinction in specific differences. Rather, Peter says, being is not a genus *not* because it is predicated *in quid* of some differences while a genus is not, but because being, unlike a genus, is predicated *by identity* of all differences. Peter's explanation appears to have its origins in Scotus' *QQ Metaph.* 4.1 and *QQ De anima* q.21 where being is said to be common not formally but by identity to its own differences.<sup>95</sup> These texts, however, seem only to say that being and its differences are really united in some third thing that is itself formally a being, just as a genus, while not formally common to its differences, is really united with them in a species. So construed, however, a community of identity is enjoyed by being and genera alike with regard to their differences. The *QQ De anima* is explicit on this point, arguing that to the extent that being is not formally but identically common to its differences, it can be called a genus.<sup>96</sup> But Peter's claim is that being is *not* a genus because it, unlike a genus,

<sup>94</sup> Below, II. 465-469, 534-543. Cf. 'Distinguo de differentiis, quod aliqua potest sumi a parte essentiali ultima, quae est res alia et natura alia ab illo a quo sumitur conceptus generis, sicut si ponatur pluralitas formarum...' (1 *Ord.* d.3. n.159 [Vat. 3.97:7-9]). That is, Peter apparently has in mind that the twofold distinction in differences is only found in a plurality of forms, which he seems to think Scotus rejects. But Scotus does hold that in the human composite, for example, there is a *forma corporeitatis* as well as the rational soul. On Scotus' notion of the *forma corporeitatis*, see Bernard Vogt, 'The *forma corporeitatis* of Duns Scotus and Modern Science', *Franciscan Studies* 24 (1943) 47-62; Prospero T. Stella, *L'ilemorfismo di G. Duns Scoto* (Turin, 1955), pp. 187-230; Bernardine M. Bonansea, *Man and His Approach to God in John Duns Scotus* (Lanham, Md., 1983), pp. 12-19.

<sup>95</sup> *QQ Metaph.* 4.1 nn.7, 10 (Vivès 7.149a, 151a-52a); *QQ De an.* q.21 nn.12-13 (Vivès 3.618a-b).

<sup>96</sup> '...sic est idem genus rei identice tantum, et non formaliter; sic etiam est in proposito de ente...' (*QQ De an.* q.21 n.12 [Vivès 3.618a]); 'Vel potest dici sustinendo, quod [sc. ens] sit genus, vel quasi genus secundum Avicennam, quod descendit in inferiora per addita, quae sunt etiam idem realiter non tamen formaliter' (ibid., p. 618b).



is predicated by identity of all differences. Peter thus must be extending Scotus' notion of identity in these texts. Indeed, Peter does develop Scotus' notion of identical predication to give rise to a type of transcendental logic.

Peter explains his notion of predication by identity in response to one of Alnwick's arguments against Scotus, which response he expands later in his *Quodlibet* q.6.<sup>97</sup> Alnwick's objection against Scotus is as follows. Every predication whose terms are taken in ultimate abstraction is quidditative and essential, for then the terms are abstracted from all accidental conditions. But this proposition, 'Rationality is entity', is true and its terms abstract. Therefore, being or entity is predicated *in quid* of ultimate differences, which is against Scotus.<sup>98</sup>

To solve this objection, Peter appropriates Scotus' distinction between formal and identical predication, restricted by Scotus himself to predication about divine attributes and essence. According to Peter, substantive terms, unlike adjectival ones, can be predicated either formally or by identity. When one or both of the substantive terms are formally infinite, then there can be predication which is identical but not formal, even if the terms are taken abstractly. Now, although the concept of being is not intensively infinite, for this is proper to God alone, nevertheless, in the order of concepts, it has an infinity of non-limitation (*illimitatio*).<sup>99</sup> Such an 'infinity' permits being to be predicated by identity of anything compatible with it. Thus the proposition, 'Rationality is entity', is true by identity, but not formally, since rationality is compatible with, but does not formally include, entity.<sup>100</sup>

Peter's solution, then, is that the generality and indeterminacy of the transcendental concept of being is so great that it possesses a type of 'infinity'. This infinity permits being to be predicated *in abstracto* by identity even of those things with which it is not formally identical, namely, of ultimate differences and the other transcendentals. The limitation or finitude of a genus, by contrast, does not permit it to be predicated of its differences by identity in this fashion. Peter's solution, however, immediately encounters an objection presented by the very texts of Scotus which inspired it.

<sup>97</sup> *Quod.* 6 'Utrum identitas identica possit poni in aliquo sine infinitate intensiva utriusque vel alterius extremorum' (Buytaert-Hooper, pp. 87-118).

<sup>98</sup> Below, II. 14-17; Dumont, p. 48.359-363.

<sup>99</sup> According to Scotus himself, the univocal concept of being is finite negatively: 'Concedo quod conceptus ille communis Deo et creaturae est finitus, hoc est non de se est infinitus, quia si esset infinitus, non esset de se communis finito et infinito; nec est de se positive finitus, ita quod de se includat finitatem, quia tunc non competeret infinito, sed est de se indifferens ad finitum et infinitum, et ideo est finitus negative, id est non ponens infinitatem, et tali finitate est determinabilis per aliquem conceptum' (Scotus, 1 *Ord.* d.8 n.141 [Vat. 4.224]).

<sup>100</sup> Below, II. 820-842; cf. *Quod.* q.6 (Buytaert-Hooper, pp. 89.53-90.84).

According to Scotus, the only predication by identity found in creatures is formal. This is why, says Scotus, traditional logic has never made a distinction between formal and identical predication.<sup>101</sup> Rather, a predication by identity which is not formal is reserved for God alone. According to Scotus, the reason for this is that when something is grasped by an ultimate abstraction, its quiddity is conceived absolutely without any reference to anything outside that quiddity itself.<sup>102</sup> Therefore, a proposition uniting terms so conceived cannot be true unless the quiddity of one term is precisely identical with the quiddity of the other. Now no two quiddities or formal realities in a creature can be precisely identical. This is because any two formal features in a creature, such as genus and difference, are finite and related as potential and actual, even when considered with utmost precision. They are thus identical to each other only because they are both identical to some third thing which they constitute as parts, in this case the species. If, therefore, such formal features are conceived abstractly and precisely, they will be conceived as abstracted from that third thing which is the cause of their identity. So conceived, then, they are abstracted from the cause of the truth of any proposition uniting them. For example, 'Animality is rationality' is false because the terms are taken in abstraction from the species which is the cause of their real identity. In God, however, any two formal perfections, such as wisdom and goodness, are formally infinite even when taken with utmost precision and abstraction. Infinity rather than unity in some third thing is the cause of identity in this case. Thus, because of their infinity, formal perfections in God which are not formally identical can be predicated of one another by a real identity even when conceived precisely and abstractly.<sup>103</sup>

Thus, based on Scotus' own analysis of predication by identity, one objection raised to Peter's solution is that in creatures every predication by identity is formal. But Peter's solution maintains, on the one hand, that 'Rationality is entity' is true by identity and, on the other, that 'rationality' and 'entity' are formally diverse. Another objection is that if the cause of identity between two formalities is some third thing, then there can be no predication by identity when those formalities are

<sup>101</sup> Cf. 'Praedicationes per se sunt formales, de identicis Aristoteles non tradidit' (1 *Ord.* d.5 n.33 'Adnotatio Duns Scoti' [Vat. 4.29:11-12]).

<sup>102</sup> On ultimate abstraction, see 1 *Ord.* d.5 nn.17-24 (Vat. 4.17-23). The term of ultimate abstraction in the substantial order is the nature absolutely considered or the so-called common nature. See 1 *Ord.* d.3 nn.310-24 (Vat. 3.188-95); 2 *Ord.* d.3 nn.31-34 (Vat. 7.402-405). On Scotus' special treatment of the common nature, see Joseph Owens, 'Common Nature: A Point of Comparison between Scotistic and Thomistic Metaphysics', *Mediaeval Studies* 19 (1957) 1-14.

<sup>103</sup> 1 *Ord.* d.8 nn.218-21 (Vat. 4.274-76). Cf. d.4 n.10 (Vat. 4.4); d.5 nn.24, 32-34, 117-18, 138 (Vat. 4.22-23, 28-30, 69-70, 78); d.8 n.127 (Vat. 4.218:20-21); d.13 nn.70-71 (Vat. 5.102-103); dd.33-34 n.3 (Vat. 6.244); *Quod.* q.5 nn.15-18 (Vivès 25.218b-21a), nn.33-42 (ed. Alluntis, pp. 184-90).

taken abstractly. But the cause of identity between being and rational is their union in a species. Therefore, 'Rationality is entity' cannot be true by identity since it is a predication *in abstracto*.<sup>104</sup>

To the first objection, Peter replies that in creatures there can be predication by identity which is not formal if the *rationes* predicated are not limited (*illimitatae*). 'Entity', however, signifies an unlimited *ratio*. As for the second objection, Peter says that the species is not the precise cause of the identity between entity and rationality, but identity is caused by infinity on the part of entity and by compatibility with entity on the part of rationality. These causes remain even if entity and rationality are conceived as abstracted from the species in which they are united.<sup>105</sup> In other words, Peter is maintaining that just as intensive infinity, and not unity in some third thing, is the cause of real identity between the divine attributes, so the infinity of indeterminacy, and not mere unity in the species, is the cause of real identity between entity and rationality. Thus the proposition 'Rationality is animality' is false because its terms are taken abstractly and so in isolation from the cause of their real identity in the species. The proposition 'Rationality is entity', however, is true by real identity, even though its terms are not formally identical and are taken in utmost abstraction, because their identity is caused not by unity in a species but by the infinity of 'entity'. As is the case with the divine attributes, the real identity between 'entity' and 'rationality' is, to use Peter's language, more 'intimate' than that caused by a mere union of parts constituting a third thing, such as occurs between genus and difference.<sup>106</sup>

It is evident from these replies that Peter has gone beyond Scotus in applying to the univocal transcendentals a type of predication apparently restricted by Scotus to statements about God. Peter's innovation was to extend predication by identity, used solely by Scotus to explain relations among the intensively infinite divine attributes, to articulate relations among the indeterminately infinite transcendental concepts and their inferiors. Indeed, Peter has done nothing less than transform what was for Scotus a *divine logic proper to God* into a *transcendental logic common to God and creatures*. While elsewhere the tendency was to sever traditional logic from the 'supernatural logic' of the Trinity, Peter Thomae sought to bring into the created realm, by means of the univocally common transcendentals, a logic of predication previously restricted to the divine attributes.<sup>107</sup>

<sup>104</sup> Below, II. 842-850.

<sup>105</sup> Below, II. 855-863.

<sup>106</sup> Below, II. 830-831; cf. II. 736-737, 758-759 and 772-773.

<sup>107</sup> On 'supernatural logic' see Philotheus Boehner, 'The Medieval Crisis of Logic and the Author of the *Centiloquium* Attributed to Ockham', *Franciscan Studies* 4 (1944) 151-70 (reprinted in *Collected Articles on Ockham*, ed. Eligius M. Buytaert [St. Bonaventure, N. Y., 1958], pp. 351-72); Hester Goodenough Gelber, *Exploring the Boundaries of Reason: Three Questions on the Nature of God by Robert Holcot, OP* (Toronto, 1983), pp. 25-28.

Peter's innovation was of course not without its antecedents. Scotus himself hints at it in an annotation to his claim that the only predication by identity in creatures is formal. The annotation records the possible objection that 'Entity is goodness' and 'Entity is truth' are true by identity, where goodness and truth are absolute properties of being, not divine attributes.<sup>108</sup> Francis of Meyronnes expands on this brief notation in much the same way as Peter Thomae does later. In an objection derived from Alnwick's critique of Scotus, Francis argues that 'Truth is entity' is true and *in abstracto*. It is thus predication *in quid*, which is against Scotus' position that being is not predicated essentially of its own properties. In defense of Scotus, Meyronnes replies that abstract terms are predicated not only formally but by identity, as is clear in the case of God. Thus the example at issue is true by identity but not formally, although not in the same way as statements about divine attributes. There can be predication by identity concerning God because of divine infinity, while here there is such predication because of the community of being.<sup>109</sup> A similar interpretation of Scotus' suggestive annotation is given by Anfredus Gonteri.<sup>110</sup> Peter Thomae nevertheless gives this transcendental logic of univocity its most systematic and complete development.

\*  
\* \* \*

William of Alnwick departed from Scotus' theory of the univocity of the concept of being on two significant points, and Peter Thomae attacked them both. First, Peter denied that the transgeneric character of univocity could be explained in terms of species because it conflicted with Scotus' own theory of individuation. Secondly, Peter argued that the formal or quidditative predication of being of all differences reduced definitions to sophisms of redundancy. However, Peter did not

<sup>108</sup> 'Contra: entitas est unitas vel veritas; si sint passiones absolutae entis, et eadem sibi' (1 *Ord.* d.8 n.218 'Adnotatio Scoti' [Vat. 4.274]). Scotus is annotating the following line: '...respondeo quod in creatura non est aliqua praedicatio per identitatem, quae non sit formaliter...' (ibid.).

<sup>109</sup> 'Sed contra ista instatur quadrupliciter. ...Tertio sic: nulla praedicatio in abstracto est vera nisi quidditativa; sed in abstracto veritas recipit praedicationem entis. Ergo etc. ... Ad tertium argumentum dico quod non solum in abstractis invenitur praedicatio quidditativa vera, sed etiam identica, sicut patet in divinis. Sed aliter haec et aliter in divinis, quia in divinis conceditur praedicatio identica propter infinitatem. Sed haec conceditur propter communitatem alterius extremi excedentis, sicut est ens' (1 *Sent.* prol. q.6 [ed. 1520, fol. 5n-o]). Cf. Dumont, p. 25.

<sup>110</sup> 'Cum dicitur quod passio entis est aliquitas et entitas, dico quod verum est, quia cum ens commune sit idem realiter omni entitati positivae, quantumcumque intelligatur absolutum, intelligitur esse idem realiter. Et ita propositio negans entitatem de quocumque ente positivo erit falsa. Ideo ista est vera "passio entis est ens et entitas realiter", non tamen per se et primo modo. Et quando probatur quod praedicatio in abstracto est praedicatio per se primo <modo>, dico quod verum est ubi praedicatum et subiectum dicunt conceptus speciales determinatos et formaliter finitos, sicut in creaturis limitatis. ... Sed ubi est praedicatio in abstracto in terminis infinitis, vel ubi alterum est formaliter infinitum, sicut in divinis, vel ubi sunt termini communes transcendentes communes finito et infinito, ut in proposito de ente et vero bono et uno, dico quod praedicatio quaecumque vera in abstracto non oportet quod sit vera in primo modo' (1 *Sent.* d.3 q.4 [Vat. lat. 1113, fol. 61va-b]).

manage to save Scotus from Alnwick without in turn being charged himself with departing from Scotus. So persuaded was Peter by the argument from redundancy that he could not see how even Scotus, at least as commonly read, could escape it. The only way Peter could find to purge the scheme of univocity entirely of redundancy was to deny the formal predication of being of all differences, not just of ultimate ones. This brought Peter into direct conflict with the received interpretation of Scotus, according to which being is predicated *in quid* of intermediate specific differences. Peter vigorously opposed this vulgar reading on the basis both of Scotus' principles and his texts. In principle Scotus could not sustain this reading since his argument from infinite regress against the *in quid* predication of being of ultimate differences held equally for mediate ones. Textually this reading had no basis since it depended upon a distinction in differences advanced only hypothetically by Scotus. In short, Peter held that no differences formally included being and that this was in fact Scotus' own view.

But Peter's revision of Scotus on the relation of being to difference, no less than that of Alnwick, required substantial addition to Scotus' theory of univocity as found in the *Ordinatio*. Both Alnwick and Peter turned to Scotus' discussion of univocity in *QQ Metaph.* 4.1 for solutions. By making every difference formally include being, Alnwick was left with no way to explain how being itself could be differentiated. From *QQ Metaph.* 4.1 he took the species model of univocity according to which being descends of itself without addition. Peter, who took the contrary view that no difference formally included being, lost from the *Ordinatio* an elegant explanation of the transgeneric character of being. He appropriated from *QQ Metaph.* 4.1 the solution that being was predicated by identity of differences. But Peter, no less than Alnwick, transformed what he found in *QQ Metaph.* 4.1. Peter did not mean, as Scotus does in *QQ Metaph.* 4.1, that being and difference are really identical because they are unified in some third thing. Rather, he meant that being and differences are really identical because of the indeterminate infinity of the transcendentals, just as the divine attributes are really identical because of their intensive infinity. Peter's extension of a predication by identity to the univocal transcendentals, which type of predication was reserved by Scotus himself for the divine attributes, is a subtle yet profound contribution to the development of Scotus' doctrine of univocity.

In sum, then, both William of Alnwick and Peter Thomae maintain with Scotus that there is an irreducibly simple and hence univocal concept of being. All three, however, differ on the nature of its univocity. Alnwick argues at length against Scotus that being is predicated formally or quidditatively of all differences. Peter Thomae maintains in direct contradiction to Alnwick that being is predicated formally of no difference. The apparent view of Scotus himself is the middle position that being is predicated formally of mediate differences, but not of ultimate ones. It is a testimony to the consistency of Scotus' doctrine that neither William

nor Peter could so revise one part of his univocity without, as we have seen, modifying another.

### THE EDITION

The *De ente* or *De transcendentibus* is a three-part treatise on metaphysics projected, but apparently never finished, by Peter Thomae.<sup>111</sup> Peter planned to treat first the concept of being, secondly its properties, and lastly its parts. Only the first part of the treatise, the fifteen questions on the concept of being, is known.<sup>112</sup> According to the colophon of the Vienna manuscript, the questions comprising the *De ente* are the product of disputations in the Franciscan studium in Barcelona.<sup>113</sup> Judging from their use of the *Sentences* of Peter of Navarre, they can be dated about 1325. Cross-references show that Peter wrote the *De ente* before his own *De modis distinctionum*, *De unitate minori*, and *Quodlibet*, but after his *De esse intelligibili*.<sup>114</sup> The *De ente* is known to survive in the four manuscripts listed below. The folios given are for question 13.<sup>115</sup>

<sup>111</sup> Peter most often uses the title *De ente*, though he does refer to his treatise as *De transcendentibus*: 'Prima est haec: nulla istarum realitatum, scilicet generis et differentiae ultimatae et quiditative abstracta, includit aliam, cuius ratio est quia dicunt conceptus primo diversos in re, ut patuit in *Quaestionibus de transcendentibus*' (*De modis distinctionum* q.2 [Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek 1494, fol. 51vb]); '...scilicet rationes generis et differentiae sunt primo distinctae, ut patet in *Quaestionibus de ente*' (ibid., fol. 51rb).

<sup>112</sup> Buytaert, 'Scholastic Writings', 933-36. Buytaert transcribes the prologue which outlines the plan of the work and gives a table of questions.

<sup>113</sup> 'Expliciunt quaestiones de ente disputatae et declaratae a fratre Petro Thomae de ordine fratrum minorum in studio Barchinonae' (fol. 46vb).

<sup>114</sup> 'Praeterea quod non habet esse quiditativum non potest mensura quiditativa. Sed ens rationis non habet esse quiditativum nisi aequivoco, ut patet ultima quaestione *De ente*' (*De unitate minori* q.8 [Vat. lat. 2190, fol. 118v]). Peter's *Quodlibet* explicitly cites the *De ente* at Hooper-Buytaert, pp. 21.671-672, 98.365, 126.251, 187.53 (*bis*). The *De ente* cites the *De esse intelligibili*: 'Ad quantum praemitto primo quod quia ut dicit Scotus in suis *Theorematis* "intelligibile intellectionem natura praecedere necesse est". Et idem potest haberi ex dictis Augustini, ut in *Quaestionibus de esse intelligibili*' (*De ente* q.10 [V 62r]). Peter was apparently at work on the *De modis distinctionum* while writing the *De ente*: 'Respondeo: an modus intrinsecus distinguatur et quomodo distinguatur est magna difficultas, de qua, Deo dante, dicitur in *Quaestionibus de modis distinctionum*' (*De ente* q.14 [V 58r]); 'Minor est evidens, nam ut alias, Deo largiente, videbitur compositio identitati identicae repugnat' (ibid.). The *De modis distinctionum* refers to the *De ente*. See note 111 above.

<sup>115</sup> On the manuscripts see: Victorin Doucet, 'L'œuvre scolastique de Richard de Conington', *Archivum franciscanum historicum* 29 (1936) 401 note 1; Cesare Cenci, *Manoscritti francescani della Biblioteca Nazionale di Napoli*, 2 vols. (Rome, 1971), 2.851-52; Henry Coxe, *Catalogus codicum mss. qui in collegiis aulisque Oxoniensibus hodie asservantur: pars II* (Oxford, 1852), pp. 45-46; Anneliese Maier, *Codices vaticani latini: codices 2118-2192* (Vatican City, 1961), pp. 219-24; *Tabulae codicum manu scriptorum... in Bibliotheca Palatina Vindobonensi asservatorum*, 10 vols. (Vienna, 1864; rpt. Graz, 1965), 1.244. The scribe of the Vatican manuscript is certainly 'Gonsalvus Carriensis ordinis fratrum minorum', not 'Cassionensis' as given by Maier, p. 202. 'Carriensis' is 'Carrión de los Condes' (Palencia), and thus the Vatican witness is probably of Spanish origin.

- N = Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale VIII F 17, fols. 142va-147va. s. xiv.  
 O = Oxford, Magdalen College 80, fols. 33ra-36vb (incomplete). s. xiv.  
 V = Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Vat. lat. 2190, fols. 48v-55v.  
 s. xiv.  
 W = Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek 1494, fols. 35va-41ra. s. xv

Owing to mutilation, the Oxford manuscript is incomplete, breaking off at line 846 of our edition. Furthermore, the Oxford witness gives our question as 14 rather than 13, for which it has instead, 'Utrum unitas, veritas, bonitas ut sunt passionis entis, dicant aliquid absolute vel relative'. This latter question is in fact an intrusion from Peter's *Quodlibet* q.3.<sup>116</sup> The Naples manuscript suffers from several long omissions that have been repaired in the margins only to have been mostly trimmed off (below, ll. 402-403, 482-484, 607-609, 824-826). Collation shows that NW have descended from one common source and OV from another, although O often carries independent readings. For example, O alone has shifted the word order of Aureoli's arguments to make them conform exactly to his *Scriptum* (below, ll. 550-551, 554-556, 557-558). Generally speaking, NW preserve the better text.

For the present edition we have collated from microfilm copies all witnesses for the entire length of the text. All variant readings are displayed in the *apparatus criticus* except disagreement over indefinite and demonstrative adjectives and pronouns, *ergo/igitur*, and *quia/quod*. Minor differences of word order, corrections that do not effect a change of meaning, and marginal indications are not noted. Simple repetitions of words and phrases are omitted. *Rno*, *Rn°* and *R°* have been consistently expanded as *respondeo*. The *apparatus fontium* identifies Peter's explicit citations as well as his implicit sources and internal references.

<sup>116</sup> Buytaert, 'Scholastic Writings', 936; Hooper-Buytaert, pp. 35-60.

## &lt;QUAESTIONES DE ENTE PETRI THOMAE&gt;

<Q. 13: UTRUM ENS PRAEDICETUR  
IN QUID DE ULTIMIS DIFFERENTIIS>

## &lt;Rationes Alnwick contra Scotum&gt;

5 Ad tertium decimum sic proceditur: et videtur quod ens praedicetur in quid de  
ultimis differentiis, quia per hoc quod philosophi erant certi de primo principio  
quod erat ens et dubitabant an esset hoc ens vel illud, concluditur secundum  
Scotum ens esse univocum primo principio et principiatis. Sed philosophi erant  
certi de ultima differentia quod erat ens, et tamen non erant certi an esset substantia  
10 vel accidens. Ergo per eandem rationem ens est commune univocum dictum in  
quid de ultimis differentiis. Minor probatur, aliqui enim istorum posuerunt  
materiam esse totam substantiam, et secundum illos formae substantiales a quibus  
sumuntur differentiae essent accidentia.

Praeterea omnis praedicatio in abstracto est essentialis et quiditativa. Sed ista est  
15 vera 'rationalitas est entitas'. Ergo entitas praedicatur quiditative de rationalitate.  
Maior patet, quia est secundum ultimam abstractionem a conditionibus acci-  
dentalibus. Minor probatur, quia rationalitas non est nihileitas.

Confirmatur: quidquid essentialiter praedicatur de praedicato essentialiter  
praedicatur de subiecto. Sed entitas essentialiter et non per accidens est ens. Ergo  
20 rationalitas essentialiter est ens.

Praeterea denominabile non praedicatur secundum se de denominativo nec  
determinabile de determinativo. Sed haec est secundum se 'rationalitas est ens'.

5-91 Hic rationes Alnwick verbatim et ordinatim habentur. Vide Alnwick, 1 *Sent.* q.8 (ed. Dumont, pp. 47.341-352, 48.359-49.397, 50.418-443, 51.446-52.475). 7-8 Scotus, 1 *Ord.* d.3 n.29 (Vat. 3.18-19). 8-10 *ibid.* n.138 (Vat. 3.86). 14-15 Cf. *ibid.* n.159 (Vat. 3.97-98); d.8 n.127 (Vat. 4.216:20-21).

5 Ad *om.* *N* tertium] quantum *O* praedicetur] -catur *O* in quid *om.* *V* 6 quod  
*om.* *V* erant] fuerunt *V* 7 dubitabant] -tant *O* concluditur] -dit *N* 8 principiatis]  
praedicamentis *O* 9 quod...ens *om.* *O* esset] erat *O* 10 vel] aut *W:* *om.* *N*  
11 posuerunt] ponunt *O:* *om.* *V* 12 substantiam] rei *add.* *O* formas *V* 13 essent] erant  
*W:* sunt *O* 14 in abstracto] abstracta *V* 16 Maior] minor *V* ultimam] -mam *V*  
17 nihileitas] non entitas *O* 18 praedicato] -camento *N* 19 ens] entitas *NV* 20 essen-  
tialiter *om.* *N* 21 de *om.* *W* denominativo] -tivis *O:* -nato *V* nec] non *N* 22 de  
determinativo] determinato *V*



Ergo sic dicendo non est praedicatio denominativa. Ergo est praedicatio superioris de inferiori et per consequens univoci de univoco. Maior probatur, quia haec 25 'album est lignum' est per accidens ex 1 *Posteriorum*, quia non praedicatur quod natum est praedicari nec subicitur quod natum est subici. Minor probatur ex opposito, quia praedicatur quod natum est praedicari et subicitur quod natum est subici. Consequentia ultima probatur, nam omne univocum praedicatur secundum se de univoco.

30 Praeterea nullum obiectum potest causare conceptum simpliciter simplicem alterius obiecti nisi contineat ipsum virtualiter vel essentialiter secundum Scotum. Sed ultima differentia concepta non solum facit conceptum proprium sed etiam conceptum entis. Ergo ultima differentia continet conceptum entis aut virtualiter aut essentialiter: sed non virtualiter cum ens non sit passio; ergo formaliter et 35 essentialiter. Minor probatur, concipiens enim quodcumque obiectum ex ipso potest concipere ens.

Praeterea attribuens aliquam perfectionem deo ex creaturis abstrahendo eam ab omni imperfectione capit aliquid quod est unius rationis in eo cui attribuitur et in eo a quo abstrahitur secundum Scotum. Sed ultima differentia includit aliquam 40 perfectionem simpliciter. Ergo intellectus abstrahendo huiusmodi perfectionem ab omni imperfectione et attribuens deo capit aliquid quod est unius rationis in deo et ultima differentia, et per consequens aliquid praedicatur in quid de deo et ultima differentia. Minor probatur, rationalitas enim includit unitatem intelligibilitatem veritatem bonitatem et entitatem.

45 Praeterea si aliquid inest alicui subiecto per aliqua duo quibus inest, magis inest illi per quod magis inest illi subiecto. Sed ens inest speciei tam ratione generis quam ratione differentiae, cum ex utroque constituatur, et magis ratione differentiae ultimae tamquam ratione ultimi completivi quam ratione generis. Ergo magis essentialiter est differentia ultima ens quam genus. Maior probatur, nam esse 50 distinctum a non sensato inest homini per animal et rationale, quorum utrique inest. Sed potius inest per rationale quam per animal, et ideo esse distinctum a non sensato magis convenit rationali quam animali.

25 *APo* 1.22 (83a1-25).  
3.26-27).

31 Scotus, 1 *Ord.* d.3 n.35 (Vat. 3.21-24).

39 *ibid.* n.39 (Vat.

24 univoci] -ce *W* 25 ex *om.* *O* 25, 26 quod] aptum *add.* *OV* 27 praedicatur]  
probatur *O* quod] aptum *add.* *O* est<sup>1</sup> *om.* *W* natum<sup>2</sup>] non *N* 30 causare *ut vid.* *N*  
31 ipsum] eum *O* vel] sed *W* 32 etiam *om.* *V* 33 aut *om.* *V* 37 perfectio-  
nem] -fectam *W* ex] et *V* abstrahendo] ergo *O* 38 imperfectione] concipit et *add.* *O*  
aliquid] -quod *W* 39 a quo] quod *V* 40 intellectus] in *add.* *V* 42 et<sup>3</sup>] ut *V*  
45 per] pro *W* 46 illi<sup>1</sup>] subiecto *add.* et *cancell.* *N* quod *om.* *V* 48 tamquam] tam *V*  
tamquam...ultimi *om.* *O* completivi] -menti *V*: tivae *O* 50 et *om.* *V* quorum] quia  
*O* 51 potius] prius *N* 52 animali] animali quam rationali *NVW*

Praeterea forma secundum ultimum gradum suum sive secundum ultimam formalitatem suam est magis ens quam secundum quemcumque alium gradum suum. Sed ultima differentia sumitur ab ultima forma vel ab ultimo gradu formae. Ergo ultima differentia etc. Maior probatur VII *Metaphysicae* et II *Physicorum*. Minor probatur, quia differentia sumitur a forma sicut genus a materia.

Praeterea cuicumque accidit primum et per se obiectum potentiae intellectivae est per accidens intelligibile. Sed si ens non includitur in conceptu differentiae, accidit ipsi ultimae differentiae. Igitur si ens non includitur in conceptu ultimae differentiae, ultima differentia non erit per se intelligibilis, quod falsum est.

Praeterea unumquodque quanto plus participat de actualitate, tanto plus participat de entitate. Sed ultima differentia plus participat de actualitate quam genus vel differentia media. Ergo etc. Maior probatur, quia actus est prior potentia perfectione.

Praeterea differentia ultima est ens. Aut ergo per se aut per additum: non per additum; ergo per se etc. Minor patet, quia de illo addito quaeram aut est ens per se, et tunc standum fuit in primo, aut per additum et tunc processus in infinitum.

Confirmatur: differentia ultima est simpliciter simplex. Igitur non habet aliquid additum.

Praeterea quod per se inest superiori per se licet non primo inest inferiori. Sed ens praedicatur per se de substantia, et substantia praedicatur per se de ultima differentia. Ergo ens praedicatur per se de ultima differentia. Minor probatur: quod est pars essentialis substantiae est per se substantia. Sed ultima differentia est huiusmodi. Ergo etc.

Praeterea quaecumque simul addita faciunt nugationem, unum est de per se intellectu alterius. Sed ultima differentia addita enti facit nugationem. Ergo etc. Minor probatur, ista enim est nugatio dicendo 'ens rationalitas' sicut dicendo 'ens corporeitas'.

Praeterea Philosophus III *Metaphysicae* probat quod ens et unum non sunt genera tali ratione: genus non praedicatur de differentiis, sed ens et unum

56 *Metaph.* 7.3 t.6 (1029a6-7); *Ph.* 2.1 t.12 (193b7). 58-61 Cf. Scotum, *QQ Metaph.* 4.1 n.6 Additio (Vivès 7.148b). 80 *Metaph.* 3.3 t.10 (998b21-28).

53 suum *om.* O 54 quemcumque] quemque N 59-60 differentiae...conceptu *om.* per  
hom. O 60 ipsi *om.* N ultimae differentiae] ubi est dicere W 61 differentiae] ergo *add.*  
O se *om.* O 62-63 de...participat *om.* per hom. W 63 de actualitate *om.* O  
64 media] intermedia O Ergo etc. *om.* NO 64-65 perfectione] ut patet IX *Metaphysicae*  
*add.* W 66 Praeterea] si *add.* V per<sup>2</sup> *om.* O additum] si per se *add.* NW  
67-68 ergo...et<sup>2</sup> *om.* per hom. W 67 etc *om.* N patet] probatur O: *om.* N quaeram]  
-atur N: *om.* O 68 fuit] fuerit V in<sup>2</sup> *om.* V 69 simplex *om.* W 71 licet] sed W  
72 praedicatur<sup>1</sup>...substantia<sup>1</sup>] per se praedicatur de substantia O: praedicatur de substantia per  
se V praedicatur<sup>2</sup> per se] per se praedicatur O: per se V 73 praedicatur] etiam *add.* V  
78 est *om.* V dicendo<sup>1</sup> -dum W: *om.* O dicendo<sup>2</sup>] ista O 81 differentiis] -tia O

praedicantur de eis; ergo ens et unum non sunt genera. Quaero igitur quomodo accipit 'non praedicari' in maiori: aut absolute, et tunc falsum capit, quia genus praedicatur de differentia absolute et simpliciter, licet non per se primo modo. Si  
85 ergo non sit variatio, oportet quod similiter accipiatur in minori, scilicet quod ens per se primo modo praedicatur de differentiis. Et per consequens cum differentia ultima sit potissime differentia, erit per se primo modo ens.

Praedictae rationes sunt Alnwick arguentis contra Scotum.

Sed contra: tam intima videtur entitas unitati et veritati sicut alicui ultimae  
90 differentiae. Sed non obstante illa intimitate ens non praedicatur in quid de veritate et unitate. Ergo videtur quod nec praedicatur in quid de ultima differentia.

### <AD QUAESTIONEM>

Respondeo: primo dearticulabitur Scoti positio; secundo explicabitur quaedam imaginatio; tertio inclinabitur quaedam impugnatio.

95

### <Articulus Primus: Dicta Scoti>

Quantum ad primum, Scoti positio potest reduci ad quinque dicta:

Primum quod secundum ipsum *Super primum sententiarum* distinctione tertia differentia ultima dicitur quae non habet aliquam differentiam, quia non resolvitur in conceptum quiditativum et qualitativum, determinabilem et determinantem, sed  
100 eius conceptus est tantum qualitativus.

Secundum est quaedam distinctio talis: aliqua differentia potest sumi a parte essentiali ultima, quae est res aliqua distincta ab illo a quo sumitur conceptus generis; quaedam sumitur ab aliqua realitate seu formalitate, non distincta ab illo a quo sumitur conceptus generis distinctione rei et rei, sed distinctione realitatis  
105 et realitatis, vel non identitatis formalis. Exemplum primi est si ponantur plures

97-100 1 *Ord.* d.3 n.131 (Vat. 3.81).

d.3 nn.170, 176-86 (Vat. 7.475, 478-83).

d.3 n.179 (Vat. 7.479).

101-126 *ibid.* nn.159-60 (Vat. 3.97-99); cf. 2 *Ord.*

101-111 Cf. *ibid.* d.8 n.106 (Vat. 4.201-202); 2 *Ord.*

82 de eis] differentia *O* quomodo] quando *W* 84 simpliciter] similiter *W* 85 quod  
om. *O* accipitur *O* scilicet] secundum *N* 86 modo om. *O* praedicatur] per se *add.*  
*V* 87 modo om. *O* 88 Praedictae] praeterea dictae *N* 89 tam] cum *N* 90 differen-  
tia om. *O* illa] ultima *add.* *O* 91 praedicetur *N* 93 Responsio] -dendo *W*  
dearticulabitur] declarabitur *V*: declaratur *O* Scoti positio] ratio Scoti *N* 94 tertia *O*  
inclinabitur] declarabitur *N*: explicabitur *O* 96 quinque] duo *O* 97 Primum] dictum *add.*  
*V* distinctione tertia om. *O* 98 differentia ultima] -tiam -mam *N* dicit *N*  
differentiam om. *O* quia] quod *NOV* 99 qualificativum *N* 100 qualificativus *N*  
101 sumi] sumitur *O*: si non *N*: sine *W* 102 ultima] ultimo *W* aliqua om. *O*  
104 generis] non *add.* *V* et rei om. *O* distinctione<sup>2</sup>] secundum distinctionem *N* 105 vel  
om. *W* identitas *O* formaliter *N* est om. *V*

formae substantiales in eodem composito, et genus dicatur sumi a parte essentiali priori et differentia specifica a forma ultima, de qua patet secundum hypothesim quod est aliqua natura in re alia a natura a qua sumitur genus. Exemplum secundi de formis simplicibus, in quibus non potest accipi genus et differentia ab alia et alia  
 110 re, sumitur tamen ab alia et alia realitate seu formalitate, secundum doctrinam Scoti.

Tertium quod nulla differentia primo modo sumpta est ultima, quia in tali continentur realitates plures aliquo modo distinctae, et ideo talis natura potest concipi secundum aliquid, hoc est, secundum aliquam realitatem, et secundum  
 115 aliquam ignorari. Et per consequens talis naturae conceptus non est simpliciter simplex. Sed ultima realitas seu perfectio realis talis naturae omnino est simpliciter simplex, et ideo differentia ab illa realitate sumpta est ultima.

Quantum dictum quod de differentiis primo modo sumptis etiam in abstracto praedicatur ens in quid, cum nulla talis habeat conceptum simpliciter simplicem.  
 120 Unde sicut haec est in quid 'anima intellectiva est ens', ita haec est in quid 'rationalitas est ens', si rationalitas sit talis differentia.

Quantum dictum quod differentia secundo modo sumpta non est ens formaliter, nam illa realitas a qua sumitur non includit ens quiditative, sed habet conceptum simpliciter simplicem. Unde si talis realitas sit *a*, haec non est vera '*a* in quantum  
 125 *a* est ens' sed est per accidens, et hoc sive *a* dicat illam realitatem sive differentiam in abstracto sumptam a tali realitate.

Haec est positio fideliter ex dictis eius collecta, quam quidem diversi tripliciter intelligunt:

Quidam dicunt ipsum per differentias ultimas intellexisse solas differentias  
 130 individuales, sed hoc non est verum, ut patet inspicienti praedicta verba eius, quae sumpta sunt tam de *Lectura sua super primum* quam de *Lectura super secundum*.

Alii ipsum sequentes in omnibus dicunt quod ens est quid omnium differentiarum, non tamen praedicatur in quid de omnibus differentiis.

112-117 Cf. 1 *Ord.* d.3 n.147-48 (Vat. 3.91-92). 129-130 'Quantum ad differentias ultimas, scilicet individuales...' (Petrus de Navarra, 1 *Sent.* d.3 n.34 [ed. Azcona, 1.193:50]).  
 131 Vide textus Scoti supra ad ll. 101-126 citatos. Hic *Lectura* opus Scoti distinctum a *Ordinatione* non nuncupat. 132-133 Hanc opinionem ad litteram non invenimus. Vide autem supra, pp. 205-206.

107 priori *om. O* 109 de] in *O* 113 continentur] -nentia *N* realitatis *W* plures]  
 et *add. V* natura] non *V* 121 si] sed *V* rationalitas] -nalis *NV* sit] si *O*  
 122 dictum] est *add. N* 123 ens *om. O* 124 realiter *O* sit] sint *V* a<sup>1</sup>] ad *VW*  
 a<sup>2</sup> *om. N* 125 est] ens *N* realitatem sive *om. O* 126 sumpta *V*: numquam tam *W*  
 realitate] sive realitatem illam *add. O* 127 est *om. O* positio] ratio *W* dictis] praedictis  
*O* 128 intelligant *W* 131 tam] tamen *V* de *Lectura*<sup>1</sup>] delectatur *V* primum]  
 sententiarum *add. V* 132 est] in *add. O* 133 praedicatur *om. V*

Contra: tunc differentia ultima includeret quiditative ens, quod est expresse  
 135 contra Scotum, tunc enim non haberet conceptum simpliciter simplicem.

Alii et quasi omnes dicunt quod Scotus intendit quod ens praedicatur in quid  
 de differentiis mediis, non tamen de ultimis specificis, sed hoc mihi non videtur  
 eius principiis concordare.

### <Articulus Secundus: Opinio Propria>

#### <Prima Conclusio>

140

Quantum ad secundum sit haec prima conclusio: conceptus proprius differentiae  
 est qualitativus, nam cuius effectus formalis est qualificare eius conceptus proprius  
 est qualitativus. Sed effectus formalis ipsius differentiae est qualificare. Ergo  
 conceptus proprius differentiae est qualitativus. Minor patet, nam differentia  
 145 respondetur ad interrogationem factam per quale, et praedicatur in quale, ut dicit  
 Porphyrius. Sed hoc non esset nisi effectus eius formalis esset qualificare.

Confirmatur: omnis conceptus formaliter determinativus est formaliter qualitati-  
 vus. Sed proprius conceptus differentiae est formaliter determinativus. Ergo est  
 formaliter qualitativus. Minor patet, nam conceptus differentiae determinat et  
 150 specificat conceptum generis, et se habet ad ipsum sicut forma ad materiam et actus  
 ad potentiam. Ex hoc patet evidenter minor primae rationis.

Praeterea Philosophus v *Metaphysicae* capitulo de quali dicit sic, 'quale dicitur  
 uno modo differentia substantiae, ut quale quid homo animal bipes, quasi diffe-  
 rentia secundum substantiam qualitate existente', ubi Commentator commento 19  
 155 dicit sic, 'in hoc genere concluduntur universaliter omnes differentiae substantiales  
 ultimae, scilicet differentiae specierum ultimarum, et non ultimae, scilicet diffe-  
 rentiae generum substantiales.' Haec ille. Vocat autem genera species subalternas.

136-138 Cf.: '...licet ego non ponam conceptum entis includi quiditative in conceptu sumpto  
 <ab> ultimo gradu in forma quem voco conceptum ultimae differentiae — in hoc discordo ab  
 eis — tamen pono conceptum entis includi quiditative in conceptu differentiarum intermediarum'  
 (*Quaestiones ordinariae de conceptibus transcendentibus* q.2 [Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica  
 Vaticana Vat. lat. 869, fol. 40rb]). Ista quaestiones, quae etiam opinionem Alnwick in pugnant, ab  
 ignoto Scotico annos 1314-16 scriptae sunt. 145-146 *Isagoge*, De genere (ArL  
 1/6-7.7:24-8:4). 152 *Metaph.* 5.14 t.19 (1020a32-b1) 154-155 *In Metaph.* 5 t.19  
 (*Averrois in librum v Metaphysicorum Aristotelis Commentarius*, ed. Ruggero Ponzalli [Berne, 1971],  
 p. 164.39-41).

134 quod] ens *add. N* 135 contra] ipsum *add. V* tunc...simplicem *om. O* 137 mihi]  
 multipliciter *V* 141-142 differentiae...proprius *om. per hom. N* 142 est] conceptus *add.*  
*O* 144 est *om. V* differentia] per differentiam *O* 145 factum *V* 147 formaliter]  
 -lis *O* determinativus] -natus *V* 147-148 qualificativus *N* 148-149 Sed...qualitativus  
*om. per hom. N* 149 determinat] terminat *V* 151 Ex] et *V* rationes *N* 154 ubi]  
 dicit *O* 19] tertio *V* 156-157 specierum...differentiae *om. N* 156 non] differentiae *O*  
 scilicet] sed *V* 157 specierum subalternarum *V*: specierum subalternas *W*

## &lt;Secunda Conclusio&gt;

Secunda conclusio: differentia inferior non includit quiditative superiorem, nam  
 160 omnis conceptus quiditative includens conceptum quiditativum limitatum et  
 conceptum qualitativum limitatum est vere conceptus specificus. Ergo si differentia  
 inferior includit quiditative superiorem, differentia inferior erit vere species, quod  
 falsum est, et per consequens relinquitur intenta conclusio.

Maior est evidens, nam omne quod habet praedicatum dictum de ipso in quid  
 165 et differentiam dictam in quale est vere species, cum sit quid compositum ex genere  
 et differentia. Sed conceptus compositus ex quiditativo limitato et qualitativo  
 limitato est huiusmodi. Ergo etc.

Minor probatur, nam facta hypothesi differentia superior praedicaretur de  
 inferiori in quid, sicut quodlibet superius de suo inferiori. Constat autem quod  
 170 conceptus differentiae superioris est limitatus. Similiter oporteret quod conceptus  
 differentiae superioris contraheretur et determinaretur per aliquem conceptum  
 limitatum, quod esset formalis ratio differentiae inferioris, et per quem ipsa  
 distingueretur a differentia sibi opposita.

Falsitas conclusionis patet de se. Tunc etiam sequeretur quod essent plura  
 175 praedicamenta quam decem, nam illa species non esset species alicuius decem  
 praedicamentorum, cum sub nullo illorum directe contineatur.

Praeterea si differentia inferior includit quiditative superiorem, in omni defini-  
 tione artificialiter assignata erit nugatio. Consequens est inconveniens, ergo et  
 antecedens. Probatio consequentiae: definitio artificialis vel datur per genus  
 180 proximum, quod quidem omnes differentias superiores continet, et per differentiam  
 ultimam, vel per genus primum cum omnibus differentiis intermediis usque ad  
 ultimam inclusive, ut patet per Philosophum VII *Metaphysicae* et II *Posteriorum*. Sed  
 facta hypothesi quocumque praedictorum dato, idem multotiens repetetur cum  
 ultima differentia omnes superiores includat, et per consequens vitari non poterit  
 185 nugatio de definitione artificialiter assignata.

159-202 Cf. Scotum, *QQ Metaph.* 7.17 (Vivès 7.449a-452a); 4 *Ord.* d.11 q.3 nn.47-49 (Vivès 17.429b-31b). 182 *Metaph.* 7.12 t.43 (1037b 28-31, 1038a 28-30); *APo* 2.13 (96b15-97a19), 2.5 (91b11-92ab).

160 quiditative] -vus V 161 specificus] specialissime W: species N Ergo] sed N  
 162 includat NV differentia inferior om. O 164 quod habet] habens O 165 dictum  
 O 166 et<sup>1</sup>] ex add. N et<sup>2</sup>] ex add. O 167 est...etc. om. N 169 quodlibet] quod  
 N Constat] conceptus N autem] ergo O 170 est] sit O 172 et om. O quem]  
 aliquem V 173 distinguantur V 174 conclusionis] consequentis O se om. O  
 175 illa] isti N 177 si om. V includit] quae includat V 178 erit] est O  
 180 continet ut vid. N 182 *Metaphysicae*] igitur add. N 183 repetatur V: reputabitur O  
 184 poterit] possit O 185 de] in N artificialiter] artificiali V assignata om. OVW

Contra: quod praedicatur de aliquo in abstracto praedicatur de illo per se primo modo. Sed differentia superior praedicatur de inferiori in abstracto. Ergo praedicatur de illa per se primo modo, et per consequens differentia inferior includit quiditative superiorem. Minor probatur, nam scissio pedis respicit pedalitatem  
 190 sicut differentia inferior superiorem. Sed pedalitas praedicatur de scissione pedis, nam pedalitas dividitur per scissionem pedis et continuationem pedis. Divisum autem praedicatur de dividendibus. Ergo differentia superior praedicatur de inferiori in abstracto.

Praeterea si una differentia non praedicatur per se primo modo de alia, ergo  
 195 quaelibet differentia erit simpliciter primum praedicatum, quod videtur inconueniens, tunc enim erunt plura simpliciter prima praedicata.

Ad primum: haec propositio 'scissio pedis est pedalitas' non est vera formaliter, nec pedalitas dividitur ut accipit argumentum, sed 'habens pedes', aliquis enim habet pedes scissos, aliquis non scissos.

200 Ad secundum: non habeo pro inconuenienti quod sint plura praedicata non quiditative prima, non quidem primitate communitatis sed primitate irresolubilitatis.

### <Tertia Conclusio>

Tertia conclusio: conceptus proprius differentiae est simpliciter simplex, nam  
 205 conceptus simpliciter non includens est simpliciter simplex, ut patet ex dictis in quadam quaestione superiori. Sed conceptus proprius differentiae est simpliciter non includens. Ergo est simpliciter simplex.

189-190 'Nam fissio pedis pedalitas quaedam est' (*Metaph.* 7.12 t.43 [1038a15; ArL 25/2.147:1]). 197 Cf. supra, ll. 189-190. 205-206 *De ente* q.6 'Utrum inter conceptus quiditativos solus conceptus entis sit simpliciter simplex': 'Et voco conceptum simpliciter simplicem omnem conceptum irresolubilem in conceptus alios priores.... Primum corollarium est quod conceptus simpliciter simplex est inclusus et nullo modo includens. Hoc apparet, quia si aliquem conceptum includeret, iam esset resolubilis, et per consequens non simpliciter simplex. Cum omnis conceptus non includens includatur, sequitur quod talis conceptus erit inclusus' (V 12v).

186 illo] alio *N* 188 illa] ipso *O* 189 pedis] pedes *W*: lapidis *V*: est pedalitas et *add.*  
*O* 190 inferior superiorem] superior inferiorem *O* pedalitas] primo *add. et del.?* *W*  
 192 autem] ergo *O* de<sup>2</sup>] differentia *add. V* 194 praedicatur...modo] de se primo modo  
 praedicatur *O* 195 simpliciter *om. V* primum] -ma *W* praedicatum] -camentum *OV*  
 196 enim *om. OV* erunt *om. O* praedicata] -camenta *OV* 197 primum] licet *add.*  
*N*: argumentum negatur minor ad probationem *add. O* propositio] praedicatio *N*: positio *V*  
 est] sit *N* 198 dividitur] dicitur *O* 200 secundum] argumentum *N* praedicata] -camenta  
*OV* 201 prima] -mo *W* primitate<sup>1</sup>] primitatem *N* 205-207 ut...simplex *om. per hom.*  
*O* 206 quadam...superiori] praedicta conclusione superius *V* superiori] -orius *N*  
 simpliciter] simplex *add. N* 207 est...simplex] etc. *N*

Probatio minoris, nam si aliquem conceptum includit, aut includit conceptum generis quod dividit, aut conceptum speciei quam constituit, et patet quod neutrum  
 210 horum dari potest; aut conceptum differentiae superioris, et patet quod non ex praecedenti; aut conceptum aliquem transcendentem, puta entis, sed hoc rationaliter dari non potest. Ergo conceptus proprius differentiae est simpliciter non includens.

Probatio assumpti: primo ex nugationis inevitabilitate, quia si conceptum entis  
 215 includit, in qualibet definitione erit nugatio, idem enim multotiens repetetur, cum ens tam in genere quam in qualibet differentia quiditative ex hypothesi includatur.

### <Opiniones Scoti et Alnwick de Nugatione>

Respondet Scotus *Super primum sententiarum* quod quando duo inferiora ad tertium sic se habent quod unum denominat alterum, illud commune particulariter  
 220 denominat seipsum. Exemplum: albedo, quae est inferior ad ens denominat animal, quod est similiter inferius ad ens. Et ideo sicut ista 'animal est album' est denominativa, ita haec 'aliquid ens est entale' est denominativa. Ens enim quod est superior ad album potest denominare animal sive ens particulariter sumptum, scilicet pro animali, puta si illud denominativum sit entale. Cum igitur dicitur  
 225 'animal rationale', in animali includitur quiditative, in rationali includitur ens denominative. Et sicut rationalitas est ens, ita rationale denominatur ab ente.

Est autem advertendum quod in praedicta responsione supponit Scotus quod rationalitas sit differentia sumpta ab aliqua parte essentiali, ut patet expresse per ipsum. Sed ista responsio videtur multipliciter dubia, tum quia propositio super  
 230 quam fundatur non est multum clara, nec ipse eam declarat nisi in exemplo ad propositum de quo est dubium; tum quia stat ratio, ex quo enim ens includitur quiditative in qualibet differentia, quidquid dicatur de illa denominative, stabit quod

214 infra, II. 310, 318. 218-226 1 *Ord.* d.3 n.161 (Vat. 3.99-100). 227-229 'Tunc sicut ens dicitur in quid de illa parte essentiali a qua sumitur differentia talis specifica, ita dicitur in quid de tali differentia in abstracto...ita haec est in quid "rationalitas est ens", si *rationalitas sit talis differentia*' (Scotus, ibid. n.159 [Vat 3.97]).

208 si *om.* *V* aut includit *om.* *W* 209 quod<sup>1</sup>] quem *O* aut] includit *add.* *V*  
 quam] quem *N* 210 horum *om.* *V* aut] etiam *add.* *V* 211-212 rationaliter] -nabiliter  
*W*: formaliter *O* 212 est *om.* *W* 214 primo ex *om.* *O* inevitabilitatem *N*  
 215 repeteretur *O* 218 responderet *W* 219 unum] determinat vel *add.* *O* 221 simili-  
 ter] simpliciter *N* sicut] sit *O*: *om.* *V* 222 haec] ista *O* entale] essenziale *VW*  
 223 superior *N* denominare] -native *N* 224 pro animali] per animalia *N* puta] potest  
*O* denominatum *O* sit entale] sicut essenziale *V* 225 ens<sup>1</sup> *om.* *V* 227 praedicta]  
 dicta *O* 229 multipliciter] mihi *OW* 230 multa *O* nisi *om.* *O* 231 de] in *O*  
 quo<sup>2</sup> *om.* *V* 232 denominative] -natione *W*



idem saepius repetetur; tum quia videtur innuere quod differentia abstractive  
significata includat quiditative ens, et concretive significata includat ipsum tan-  
tummodo denominative, quod non videtur rationabile, nam quidquid includit  
quiditative rationalitatem, includit quiditative quidquid in ipsa rationalitate includi-  
tur quiditative; sed rationalitas includitur in rationali quiditative, et rationalitas per  
datam responsionem includit quiditative ens; ergo rationale includit quiditative ens,  
quod est contra responsionem.

240 Ideo aliter vitat praedictam nugationem Alnwick dicens quod nugatio est in  
definitione quando idem conceptus intrans definitionem alicuius naturae ut pertinet  
ad definitionem bis actualiter habetur. Ens autem non intrat definitionem alicuius  
naturae nec pertinet ad definitionem, et ideo propter multiplicem inclusionem  
entis, non est nugatio in definitione. Si enim propter reduplicationem entis esset  
245 nugatio, hic esset nugatio 'homo albus' et ubique ubi terminatur unus conceptus  
per alium, quia ens est de intellectu cuiuslibet.

Contra: quod dicit totam essentiam cuiuslibet definientium intrat definitionem  
formaliter. Sed conceptus entis per te dicit totam perfectionem et totam essentiam  
cuiuslibet definientium. Ergo conceptus entis intrat definitionem formaliter, quod  
250 est contra te. Immo non videtur intelligibile quod *a* dicat totam essentiam *b*, et *b*  
intret aliquam definitionem essentialiter ipso *a* non intrante.

Praeterea ens secundum eandem rationem includitur quiditative in genere et  
differentiis cum utrisque sit univocum uniformiter per te. Ergo semper stabit quod  
in definitione idem quiditative multotiens repetitur, et per consequens nugatio nisi  
255 plus dicatur.

Nec valet illa obiectio, quia in homine et in albo non uniformiter replicatur ens.  
Ad cuius evidentiam est advertendum quod, licet ens ut ens habeat unam propriam

232-235 '... nam in animali includitur ens quiditative, et in rationali includitur ens denominative;  
et sicut "rationalitas" est ens, ita "rationale" denominatur ab ente: esset ergo hic nugatio, "animal-  
rationalitas", non hic "animal-rationale"' (Scotus, *ibid.* n.161 [Vat. 3.99-100]). 240-246 Alnwick,  
(ed. Dumont, pp. 72.1068-73.1074). 248 'per te', sc. Alnwick: 'Ens autem praedicat totam  
essentiam cuiuslibet de quo praedicatur' (ed. Dumont, p. 61.737-738). 250 'contra te', sc.  
Alnwick. Vide supra, 11. 242-244. 253 'per te', sc. Alnwick (ed. Dumont, p. 51.463-470).  
256 'illa obiectio', sc. quae supra (II. 244-246) invenitur.

233 repeteretur *O*: repraesentetur *W* 234 significata<sup>1</sup> *om. O* includat<sup>1</sup> <sup>2</sup>] -dit *O*  
quiditative...includat<sup>2</sup> *om. per hom. N* 235 rationale *W* 236 rationalitatem] -nabilitatem *N*  
rationalitate] -nabilitate *N*: quid *O* 237 rationalitas<sup>1</sup> -nabilitas *N* 238 ergo...ens *om.*  
*OV* 240 vitat] vitam *O* dicens] dicit *O* 241 quando] quod *N* ut *om. N*  
241-242 pertinent ad] -nens a *N* 243 nec] ut *OV*: *om. W* a definitione *V* 245 nuga-  
tio<sup>1</sup>] -gatione *O* ubique ubi] ubicumque *V*: ubicumque *bis O* terminatur] -nat *W*: -natus *O*  
conceptus] est *add. O* 246 alium] alterum *O* 247, 249 definientium] differentium *N*  
248 perfectionem] essentiam definiti *O* 249 conceptus entis *om. N* 250 dicat] indicat  
*O* 251 intrat *OVW* 252 ens *om. V* rationem *om. O* 253 utrique *V*: utrumque *O*:  
quod *add. N* semper *om. O* 254 idem] ideo *W* 256 ens *om. O* 257 advertendum]  
sciendum *N* ens<sup>2</sup>] enti *W* habet *N* unam propriam] aliquam unam *O*

rationem de se indifferentem ad substantiam et accidens, ut patet ex superius declaratis, tamen ens ut includitur in substantia idem est quod substantia et sic  
 260 habet modum subsistentis; ut includitur in accidente idem est quod accidens et habet modum inhaerentis et denominantis, nam quidquid recipit denominationem ab aliqua specie recipit denominationem a quolibet superiori ad illam speciem. Exemplum: quidquid denominatur ab albedine denominatur a colore et qualitate, omne enim album et est coloratum et quale. Similiter videtur quod quidquid  
 265 denominatur ab accidente denominatur ab ente, ut si liceat fingere cum Scoto, hoc denominativum entale potest dici: 'omne album est entale'.

Contra: ergo ens praedicabitur denominative, et per consequens conceptus eius est denominativus, cuius oppositum dictum est supra. Respondeo: non est inconveniens quod ens praedicetur denominative per accidens, scilicet ut includitur in  
 270 aliquo suo inferiori quod per se aptum natum est denominare, sed ex hoc non sequitur quod proprius eius conceptus sit qualitativus.

Ex praedictis patet quod non uniformiter replicatur ratio entis in homine et in albo. Patet etiam quod petit ultimum dictum illius responsionis, scilicet quod ens est de intellectu cuiuslibet.

275 Ideo idem Alnwick vitare nititur praedictam nugationem dicens quod nugatio est quando idem conceptus bis habetur secundum eandem rationem, ut quando idem conceptus ponitur bis per modum qualitativum vel bis per modum quiditativum, sed quando ponitur semel per modum quiditativum et alias per modum qualitativum seu denominativum non est nugatio. Exemplum: hic non est nugatio  
 280 'color albus', quamvis color bis habeatur, quia in se habetur per modum quiditativum, in albedine per modum denominativum. Hic tamen est nugatio 'coloratum album' vel 'color albedo', quia bis replicatur secundum eundem modum et inutiliter. Ad propositum: ens ut est de conceptu generis dicit conceptum quiditativum,

258-259 *De ente* q.4 'Utrum ens habeat conceptum proprium distinctum a conceptu cuiuslibet entis specialis' (V 6r-8v). 265 Cf. '... puta si illud denominativum essent entale, haec esset vera "aliquid ens est entale"' (Scotus, 1 *Ord.* d.3 n.161 [Vat. 3.99:15-16]). 268 *De ente* q.2 'Utrum conceptus entis sit quiditativus' (V 3r-v) 273-274 supra, l. 256. 275-288 Alnwick (ed. Dumont, p. 73.1075-92).

260 habet...subsistentis] huiusmodi subsistens V accidente] et add. V 262 speciem om. N 263 Quidquid] quod quiddam O 264 et'] in W et' om. NW quod om. V 265 si om. N Scoto om. OV 266 dici] quod add. O 267 praedicatur O 268 est' om. V dictum om. N supra] prius O Responsio] quod add. O 269 scilicet ut] fuit W 270 inferiora O quod...denominare] quod per se potest denominare in marg. N 271 sit] est O 272 replicatur] explicatur O 273 petit] peccat OV 275 Ideo] et ideo V vitare om. V nititur] innititur O: videtur N: nutritur (?) W 276 bis habetur] ponitur bis O 278 sed...quiditativum om. per hom. N ponitur] bis add. O et...modum<sup>1</sup>] vel per N 280 habetur] -retur V 280-281 quiditativum] et add. N 281 albedine] albo N 282 et] ideo add. NW 283 propositum ens] probationes N

ut autem exprimitur per differentiam habet modum qualitativum determinativum  
 285 et denominativum. Unde non est hic nugatio 'animal rationale', licet ens per se  
 praedicetur de utroque, non enim inutiliter replicatur propter diversum modum  
 praedictum. Sed hic est nugatio 'animal rationalitas', quia bis eodem modo  
 conceptus entis replicatur.

Sed hoc non videtur satisfacere, nam sola illa diversitas modorum excusat  
 290 nugationem quae se tenet ex parte eius cui nomen imponitur, et illius a quo nomen  
 imponitur. Hoc patet, non enim omnis diversitas modorum nugationem excusat.  
 Diversitas siquidem modi significandi grammaticalis proveniens etiam ex diversi-  
 tate illius a quo nomen imponitur, non vitat. Nam hic est nugatio 'petra lapis',  
 tamen ab alio imponitur petra et ab alio lapis. Similiter hic 'anthropos homo',  
 295 homo enim ab humo imponitur, anthropos dicitur quasi arbor conversa. Diversitas  
 etiam modi significandi logicalis, puta secundum abstractum et concretum, nuga-  
 tionem non vitat, ut hic 'humanitas homo', vel penes implicitum et explicitum, ut  
 patet in definitione et definito.

Ex praedictis accipio istam propositionem: nulla diversitas vitat nugationem nisi  
 300 sit aliquo ex natura rei. Sed diversitas modi quiditativi et modi qualitativi vitant  
 nugationem per te. Ergo isti modi distinguuntur ex natura rei. Quaero ergo per  
 quid distinguitur modus qualitativus differentiae a modo quiditativo generis? Aut  
 per rationem entis, aut per aliquid positivum additum enti, aut per aliquid  
 negativum, aut per praecisam rationem differentiae. Non per rationem entis, quia  
 305 in illa conveniunt per te. Nec per aliquid positivum, quia secundum te nihil potest  
 addi enti. Nec per aliquid negativum, quia nulla negatio includitur in intellectu  
 alicuius positivi. Ergo relinquitur quod per praecisam rationem differentiae, et per  
 consequens praecisa ratio differentiae nec ens nec aliquid aliud quiditative includit  
 nisi seipsam, quod est propositum.

301 'per te', sc. Alnwick. Vide supra II. 275-288. 304-305 'per te', sc. Alnwick. Vide supra,  
 II. 252-253. 305-306 '... nullum positivum est additum enti...' (Alnwick, [ed. Dumont, p.  
 71.1015-16]).

284 Ut] aut *O* habet] dicit *O* 285 et *om. OV* non est] nec *N* per se *om. O*  
 286 modum *om. O* 287 animal] -litas *O* 288 replicatur] contra *add. in marg. W<sup>2</sup>*  
 290 teneat *N* nomen<sup>1</sup> *mut. in nomini W* illius] nominis *add. O* 291 non enim] nam  
 non *O* omnis *om. N* modorum] significandi *add. O* 292 Diversitas] modus significandi  
 grammaticalis *add. V* siquidem] quidem *O* modi] -dus *V* 293 est *om. V* 294 alio<sup>1</sup>  
*om. O* alio<sup>2</sup>] imponitur *add. W* 296 etiam *om. V* 297 vel] scilicet *O* implicitum  
 et explicitum] implicatum *O* 299 accipimus *V* istam] aliam *O* propositionem]  
 probationem *V* 299-300 nisi...rei] per te ergo isti modi distinguuntur ex natura rei *V*  
 300 aliquo] distincta *add. O* vitat] vitat *W*: bis *O* 301 rei *om. N* 305 in *om. OV*  
 positivum] per te additum enti *add. O* 307 praecisam *om. N* 308 aliud *om. O*  
 quiditative *om. V* 309 propositum] ergo conceptus propriae differentiae est non includens et  
 hoc fuit assumptum probandum in tertia conclusione *add. O*

- 310 Secundo probo illud assumptum ex formalis rationis differentiae proprietate sic: conceptus eius quod est praecisa ratio differendi est simpliciter non includens. Sed formalis ratio differentiae est praecise ratio differendi. Ergo conceptus formalis differentiae est simpliciter non includens. Maior videtur evidens, quia si includit alium conceptum communioem, puta entis, oportet quod in illo conveniat cum  
 315 aliquo alio, et per consequens non erit praecisa ratio differendi. Minor patet, tum ex ratione nominis, tum per Pophyrium dicentem quod 'omnis differentia aut facit alteratum aut facit aliud'.

- Tertio persuadeo idem ex processus in conceptibus infinitate, nam omnes conceptus primo diversi sunt simpliciter simplices. Sed conceptus differentiarum  
 320 oppositarum sunt primo diversi. Ergo sunt simpliciter simplices. Maior videtur evidens, nam primo diversa sunt nihil idem entia ex v *Metaphysicae*. Sed omnes conceptus non simpliciter simplices sunt aliquid idem entia, id est commune aliquid includentes. Minor probatur, tum quia differentiae non sunt differentes sed ratio differendi, tum quia si non sunt primo diversa, in aliquo conveniunt et in  
 325 aliquo differunt. Quaero igitur de illis per quae differunt: aut sunt primo diversa aut non. Si sic, habeo propositum et eadem ratione stare potuit in primo. Si non, ergo in aliquo conveniunt et in aliquo differunt, et sic in infinitum.

- Ad hanc probationem quae accipitur a Scoto respondet Alnwick quod non sequitur quod si differentiae includant univoce ens, ergo differentiae sunt diffe-  
 330 rentes, nam secundum Scotum prima genera includunt ens univoce, et tamen non sunt omnia differentia sed diversa, nam si essent proprie differentia essent vere species et haberent differentias. Dicendum est ergo quod ad hoc quod aliqua sint proprie differentia, oportet quod includant actualitates quae sunt extra rationem illius in quo sunt idem. Nihil autem est extra rationem entis, et ideo propter  
 335 identitatem in ente et diversitatem aliquorum inter se, non dicentur aliqua differentia proprie.

310, 318 supra, l. 214. 316-317 *Isagoge*, De differentia (ArL 1/6-7.15:5-6).  
 318-327 Scotus, 1 *Ord.* d.3 n.132 (Vat. 3.81-82). 321 *Metaph.* 5.9 (1018a12-13).  
 328-336 Alnwick (ed. Dumont, pp. 52.499-53.507).

310 sic *om.* V 311-313 Sed...includens *om.* per *hom.* V 312 formalis] rationis *add.* O  
 313 includit] -dat O 316 ex] quia O tum] tum quia O: tam V 317 alteratum]  
 alterum NW facit *om.* N 318 processu O omnis NOV 319-320 Sed...simplices *om.*  
 per *hom.* V 320 oppositarum] -ta et O 321 Sed in *margin.* N 322 non *om.* N  
 aliquid] -quod V entia] -tes NW: -tis V id est] quod (est *cancell.*) V: quia N  
 323 includentes] ergo etc. *add.* O 324 rationes O si *om.* V sunt] sint O convenient  
 NW 325 differunt'] -ferent NW quae] quod V 326 habeo *om.* NW stare] stari  
 W: dari O 327 in] alio *add.* V 328 probationem] propositionem NV 329 includunt  
 N 331 omnia] omnino N: *mut.* in proprie W<sup>2</sup> 332 haberent] -bet V: proprias *add.* O  
 sint] sunt O 333 proprie *om.* V actualitatem O sunt] sint N 334 illius...rationem  
*om.* per *hom.* O entis *om.* N 335 se *om.* O dicentur] -cerentur OV

Sed praedicta responsio videtur accipere quattuor dubia. Primum quia conceptus primorum generum non sunt primo diversi, immo proprie differentes, cum sint in aliquo uno conceptu reali convenientes et inter se distincti.

- 340 Secundum quia non omne differens proprie est species, alioquin solum illud quod est proprie species esset proprie differens, et tunc genus subalternum non haberet proprie differentias. Praeterea illud videtur proprie posse dici differens cui proprie convenit definitio differentis. Sed soli speciei non proprie convenit definitio differentis. Ergo nec sola species est proprie differens. Minor patet per
- 345 Philosophum v *Metaphysicae* sic dicentem, differentia dicuntur quaecumque diversa sunt alicui idem entia, et non solum numero, sed aut specie aut genere aut proportionem. Ex quibus patet quod habere identitatem in aliquo cum diversitate est praecise de per se ratione differentiae. Quod autem illa sint individua aut species aut genera hoc accidit.
- 350 Tertium de hoc quod dicit nihil esse extra rationem entis, hoc enim est dubium, non probatum.

Quantum quia ponere quod aliqua sint idem in ente et inter se diversa, et tamen quod non sint differentia videtur esse oppositum in adiecto, ut patet ex differentium descriptione praemissa.

- 355 Patet igitur illud assumptum, videlicet quod propria et formalis ratio differentiae est simpliciter non includens.

Contra: omnis conceptus resolubilis est includens. Sed conceptus alicuius differentiae est resolubilis. Ergo conceptus alicuius differentiae est includens. Probatio minoris: omnis conceptus a quo potest aliquis conceptus abstrahi est

360 resolubilis. Hoc est evidens. Sed a conceptu huius rationalitatis et illius potest abstrahi conceptus rationalitatis absolutae seu indifferentis ad hanc et illam. Similiter a sensibilitate in homine et a sensibilitate in brutis potest abstrahi conceptus sensibilitatis. Ergo conceptus alicuius differentiae est resolubilis.

Confirmatur: minus commune est resolubile in magis commune. Sed conceptus

345 supra, II. 321.      354 supra, II. 321.      355 supra, II. 206-207, 214.

---

337 responsio *om. N*      338 primorum] ipsorum *O*      proprie *om. O*      339 uno *om. O*  
convenientes *om. V*      340 quia non] quod *V*      341 proprie *om. O*      species] non *add.*  
*V*      esset] erit *N*      341-342 et...differentias *om. O*      342 videtur *om. V*      posse] -set *V*:  
*om. O*      343 convenit] competit *O*      343-344 Sed...differentis *om. per hom. N*      346 di-  
versa sunt *om. V*      idem entia] vel etiam *et cancell. W*      sed *om. N*      aut] et *O*  
348 praecisa *O*      de] et de *O*: dici *V*      differentiae *om. N*      illa *om. V*: sunt *add. N*  
351 non probatum] et non probat *O*      352 Quantum quia] quantum *V*: quia *O*      aliqua]  
absoluta vel *W*      sint] sunt *O*      idem in ente] mente *W*      353 sint] sunt *om.*  
*O*      in] et *W*      355 assumptum] in tertia conclusione *add. O*      videlicet] oportet *N*  
358 est] includens est *add. O*      358-360 Ergo...resolubilis *om. per hom. V*  
359-361 est...abstrahi *om. per hom. N*      360 a conceptu] ad conceptum *OV*      360-361 et...ra-  
tionalitatis *om. O*      361 indifferens *VW*      ad] et *add. N*      362 in<sup>2</sup> *om. N*      363 sensibi-  
litas] sensitivus *O*      364-367 Confirmatur...resolubilis *om. per hom. N*      364 resolubile] -bilis  
*O*

365 unius differentiae est minus communis respectu conceptus alterius differentiae, ut patet in rationalitate et sensibilitate. Ergo conceptus alicuius differentiae est resolubilis.

Ad primum: nego minorem propter praemissa. Ad probationem: concedo quod illa abstractio potest fieri, et per consequens quod conceptus huius rationalitatis est  
370 resolubilis, sed cum infertur 'ergo conceptus alicuius differentiae est resolubilis', nego illationem, mutatur enim hoc aliquid in quale quid.

Ad cuius evidentiam est advertendum quod cum dicitur 'haec rationalitas' vel 'haec sensibilitas' importatur quidam conceptus aggregatus ex proprio conceptu rationalitatis et conceptu haecceitatis, quorum neuter formaliter includit alium.  
375 Haecceitas enim non est formaliter rationalitas nec e converso, immo sunt rationes differendi diversae. Non est igitur bona illatio 'conceptus aggregatus est resolubilis, ergo conceptus non aggregatus est resolubilis', nec ista 'conceptus aggregatus ex conceptibus differentiarum est resolubilis, ergo conceptus praecisus differentiae est resolubilis'.

380 Ad confirmationem: maior ut videtur non est universaliter vera, nam substantia est minus communis accidente, cum accidens sit commune novem praedicamentis et substantia uni soli.

Contra: substantia et accidens non sunt subordinata; sed differentiae sunt subordinatae; ergo nihil ad propositum.

385 Et ex hoc fortificatur ratio sic: sicut se habet minus commune ad magis commune in recta linea praedicamentali, ita videntur se habere in linea laterali. Sed in recta linea sic est quod minus commune includit magis commune. Ergo similiter erit in linea laterali, et per consequens differentia minus communis includit magis communem.

390 Confirmatur: sicut se habet conceptus quiditativus ad quiditativum superiorem, sicut se debet habere qualitativus ad qualitativum superiorem. Sed quilibet quiditativus minus communis includit omnes quiditativos communiores in illo ordine. Ergo quilibet qualitativus minus communis includet omnes qualitativos communiores in illo ordine.

368 minorem] antecedens *V* 370 infertur] nec *add. V: add. et cancell. W* 372 dicitur] concipitur *O* 372-373 vel haec sensibilitas] vel sensibilitas *et cancell. W* 373 haec *om. V*  
proprio] primo *VW* 374 haecceitatis] entis *V* neuter] -trum *O* formaliter...alium]  
includit formaliter rem *O* 375 Haecceitas] entitas *OV* est *om. N* immo] ideo *V*  
376 illatio *om. O* 380 maior ut] maioris *N* universaliter] generaliter *O* 381 accidente]  
a caritate *W* 384 nihil *om. O* 385 Et *om. O* fortificatur] formetur *O* habent *N*  
minus] magis *V* ad] et *NW* magis] maius *O*: minus *V* 386 videtur se haberi *O*  
386, 388 laterali] laterali *V* 387-388 similiter erit] sic est *O* 388 includet *N*  
389 communem] -ne *NV* 391 sicut se debet] ista debet se *O* habere] conceptus *add. O*  
ad] conceptum *add. O* quilibet] conceptus *add. V* 392 communiores] superiores *O*  
ordine *om. O* 393 quilibet] quilibet conceptus *bis O* includit *OV* 393-394 communio-  
res] superiores *O*

395 Ad fortificationem: simile de linea recta et laterali non currit quattuor pedibus,  
nam quae sunt in linea recta habent quandam quiditativam conexionem. Quae  
autem sunt in laterali non sunt sic, sed si quam habent, non habent nisi median-  
tibus illis quae sunt in linea recta. Immo quae sunt in laterali sunt magis ratio  
400 est quadruplex ordo, scilicet magis communis et minus communis, includentis et  
inclusi quiditative, praedicationis et subiectionis, et necessariae praesuppositionis.  
In illis vero quae sunt in laterali est tantum duplex ordo, scilicet magis communis  
et minus communis et necessariae praesuppositionis. Nam una differentia est  
communior altera, quia in pluribus reperitur. Differentia enim minus communis  
405 necessario praesupponit magis communem, nam sensibilitas necessario praesup-  
ponit corporeitatem.

Ad confirmationem: patet ex dictis quod non est tanta conexio nec talis ordo  
qualitativorum inter se qualis est quiditativorum inter se. Quiditativi etiam possunt  
esse includentes et inclusi, sed praecise qualitativi, licet sint inclusi, non tamen  
410 possunt esse includentes, alias non essent praecise qualitativi. Teneo itaque quod  
tam conceptus cuiuslibet differentiae quam realitas a qua sumitur est simpliciter  
simplex.

Contra: omnis realitas simpliciter simplex est realitas divina. Sed realitas a qua  
sumitur differentia est huiusmodi per te. Ergo est realitas divina, quod est  
415 absurdum.

Respondeo: simpliciter simplex quantum ad propositum dupliciter potest accipi:  
uno modo ut excludit tam compositionem intrinsecam quam componibilitatem, et  
sic soli competit divinae realitati; alio modo ut excludit solam compositionem  
intrinsecam, non componibilitatem, et sic competit realitati differentiae. Est ergo  
420 aequivocatio de simpliciter simplici. Est autem advertendum quod hoc non est in

395 fortificationem] confirmationem *V* similem *V* 395-396 et...recta *om. per hom. V*  
397 sunt<sup>2</sup> *om. NW* sic] sit *W: om. O* si quam] supra *V* 398 sunt<sup>1</sup> *om. O*  
398-399 Immo...linea *om. per hom. W* sunt...quam *om. N* 399 conectendi] cognoscendi  
*V: est in marg. inf. fort. suppl. N* 400 quadruplex] simpliciter *O* scilicet] sed *O*  
includentes *V* 401 necessariae] necesse *OV* 402-403 In...praesuppositionis *om. per hom.*  
sed et magis communis et necesse praesuppositionis *in marg. sup. suppl. N* 402 duplex] triplex  
*OV* 403 necessariae] necesse *OV* 404 communior] minor *OW* enim] et *N*  
405 necessario<sup>1</sup>] necesse *O* 407 dictis] praedictis *O* non] nec *O* conexio] complexio  
*O* 408 qualitativorum] -varum *W* qualis est] sicut *O* etiam] enim *O: quae N*  
409 licet sint] etiam sunt *V* 410 essent] esset *W* 411 quam realitas *om. N* 413 rea-  
litas<sup>1, 2, 3</sup>] rationalitas *V* divina] divisiva *O: differentia W* 414 realitas] rationalitas *V*  
416 quantum] spectat *add. O* quantum...dupliciter *om. W* potest accipi] prout accipitur *W*  
417 excludat *N* tam] quam *V* 417-418 tam...excludit *om. per hom. W* 417 intrin-  
secam] intentam *V* componibilitatem] -possibilitatem *O* 418 soli] solum *O* competit]  
convenit *V* realitati] rationalitati *V* 419 intrinsecam] intentam *V* non] nec *N*  
componibilitatem] -possibilitatem *O* realitati] rationalitati *NOV* 420 autem] igitur *O*  
420-421 hoc...modo] haec conclusio non est *O* in modo] immo *W*

modo de conceptu differentiae concretive significato, puta rationale, sed abstractive, puta rationalitas.

<Quarta Conclusio>

Quarta conclusio: de nulla differentia praedicatur ens in eo quod quid, quia si  
 425 sic, ergo conceptus differentiae cuiuslibet non esset simpliciter simplex, cuius  
 oppositum persuadet praecedens conclusio. Consequentia est evidens, nam omnis  
 conceptus de quo praedicatur ens in eo quod quid est resolubililis, et per consequens  
 non simpliciter simplex. Praeterea persuasum est quod nulla differentia includit  
 quiditative ens. Ergo de nulla differentia praedicatur in quid.

430

<De Intentione Scoti>

Contra: tu non scotizas, nam Scotus ponit quod tantum de ultima differentia  
 non praedicatur ens in eo quod quid.

Respondeo: praemitto tria. Primum quod Scotus ponit expresse quod ens non  
 praedicatur in quid de ultimis differentiis. Primo, quia alias differentiae ultimae non  
 435 essent primo diversae sed differentes, et tunc procederetur in infinitum. Secundo,  
 quia sicut in rebus compositis resolutio stat ad simpliciter simplicia, puta ad actum  
 ultimum et potentiam ultimam, quae sunt primo diversa, alioquin hoc primo non  
 esset actus nec illud primo esset potentia, ita in conceptibus non simpliciter  
 simplicibus oportet omnem conceptum per se unum resolvi ad aliquos conceptus  
 440 primo diversos, quorum neuter quiditative includit alterum, videlicet ad conceptum  
 determinabilem tantum, puta conceptum entis, et ad conceptum determinativum  
 tantum, cuiusmodi est conceptus ultimae differentiae.

Respondet Alnwick ad hoc quod non est simile de ultima resolutione rerum et  
 conceptuum, quia illa stat ad simplicia secundum rem, ista stat ad simplicia  
 445 secundum abstractionem. Illud autem quod ab omnibus abstrahitur secundum

431-432 1 *Ord.* d.3 nn.131, 137, 147, 159 (Vat 3.81, 85, 91, 97). 433-442 *ibid.*  
 nn.131-33 (Vat. 3.81-83). 443-448 Alnwick (ed. Dumont, p. 53.507-517).

421 differentiae *om. V* 426 praecedens] prius *O* 428 non] est *add. O* persuasum]  
 -suasio *V* 431 tu] tamen *NW*: cum *V* scotizas] scotizes *V* Scotus] -ticus *V*  
 differentia *om. OV* 432 quod] quid *O* 433 tria] enim *V*: mihi *W* primum *om. V*  
 435 sed] secundum *W* procedetur *V* in infinitum *om. O* Secundo] tertio *W*  
 436 compositis] -sitionis *N* simplicia] -plicem *V*: sumpta *O* 437 potentia ultima *W*  
 hoc] istud *O* 440 alterum] reliquum *O* videlicet] puta *O* 441 determinabilem] -bile  
*W* tantum *om. V* determinativum] -natum *V* 442 cuiusmodi est conceptus] puta  
 conceptum *O* 443 ultimata *N* 444 simplicia<sup>1, 2</sup>] -cissima *V* stat ad] ab *N*: ad *V*  
 445 abstrahitur *om. OV*



communitatem de omnibus praedicatur, et ideo ultima resolutio conceptus compositi stat ad conceptum simpliciter simplicem indifferentem ad omnia, qualis est conceptus entis.

Contra: resolutio cuiuslibet compositi sive in re sive in conceptu est in sua  
450 componentia, unumquodque enim in illa resolvitur ex quibus componitur. Sed nihil sive in re sive in conceptu potest ex uno componi. Ergo tam in re quam in conceptu ultimata resolutio compositi non stabit ad unum sed ad plura.

Confirmatur, quia ad illa stat ultimate resolutio a quibus primo incipit compositio. Patet in composito naturali artificiali et praedicamentali. Exemplum primi  
455 corpus aliquod naturale; secundi domus; tertii equus, cuius conceptus praedicamentally resolvendo stat ad conceptum substantiae et conceptum corporeitatis, qui sunt primi in compositione praedicamentali. Patet ergo quod similitudo est conveniens. Illud autem quod assignat pro ratione similitudinis fallit. Nam in conceptibus fieri potest resolutio dupliciter. Uno modo resolvendo particularia in  
460 suum universale, et hoc fit abstrahendo unum a pluribus, et ideo talis resolutio semper procedit a pluribus ad unum. Sed de illa nihil ad b. Alio modo resolvendo conceptum compositum in conceptus ex quibus componitur, sicut si resolvam conceptum hominis in conceptum animalis et rationalis, et talis resolutio procedit ab uno ad plura, et hanc assumit Scoti ratio.

465 Secundum: Scotus ponit expresse quod omnis differentia sumpta ab aliqua parte essentiali, quae est aliqua natura alia a natura a qua sumitur genus, includit quiditative ens. Sed illud quod supponitur in isto dicto non est secundum opinionem eius. Nam ipse tenet quod genus et differentia non sumuntur ab alia et alia natura, sed ab alia et alia realitate.

470 Tertium: non legi quod expresse ponat quod ens praedicetur in quid de mediis differentiis, tamen vulgus imponit sibi, primo quia ipse non probat quod ens non praedicetur in quid nisi de ultimis; secundo quia dicit quod ultima realitas est

464 supra, II. 435-442. 465 Cf. supra, II. 433. 465-469 1 *Ord.* d.3 n.160 (Vat. 3.98:13-16). 467-469 Nullum locum ubi Scotus expresse dicit genus et differentiam non sumi ex alia et alia natura invenimus. Vide 1 *Ord.* d.3 n.159 (Vat. 3.97-98); d.8 nn.105-107, 140 (Vat. 4.200-202, 223); 2 *Ord.* d.3 n.179 (Vat. 7.479); *QQ Metaph.* 7.19 (Vivès 7.462b-72b). 470-471 supra, II. 433. 472-473 'Sed ultima realitas sive perfectio realis talis naturae, a qua ultima realitate sumitur ultima differentia, est simpliciter simplex' (1 *Ord.* d.3 n.159 [Vat. 3.98]).

450 enim *om. O* ex] et *N* 452 ultima *V* stabit] stat *O* 453 ultimata *O*  
453-454 compositio] ut *add. O* et *om. V* 455 secundi] -da *W* 456 conceptum *om.*  
*O* 457 qui] quae *O* primi] -ma *O* 458 conveniens] inconveniens *V* pro ratione]  
per rationem *V* 461-463 semper...resolutio *om. per hom. N* 462 conceptus] -tibus *V*  
resolvam] -vatur *V* 463 conceptum<sup>1</sup>] -tus *OV* 464 assumit...ratio] resolutionem sumit Scoti  
ratio *O* 465 parte *om. O* 466 natura<sup>1</sup>...natura<sup>2</sup>] alia natura *V* 467 illud] illa *O* isto]  
primo *W* 468 sumitur *O* 471 differentiis *om. N* non<sup>2</sup> *om. V* 472 praedicetur]  
-cantur *O* ultimis] differentiis *add. O* dicit] differentia *O* est *om. O*

simpliciter simplex, et similiter differentia quae ab illa sumitur; tertio quia dicit quod ens non est genus, quia ens praedicatur de aliqua differentia in quid; genus  
475 autem de nulla differentia praedicatur in quid.

His suppositis primo persuadebo ex principiis Scoti quod ens de mediis differentiis non praedicatur in quid; secundo quod ipse non contradicit sibi.

De primo: prima ratio eius, scilicet quod differentiae essent differentes et procederetur in infinitum, ita probat de mediis sicut de ultimis.

480 Dices quod non, quia statueretur ad conceptum entis et ultimae differentiae, ut probat secunda ratio.

Contra: oportet totum resolvable quiditative includere partes ex quibus componitur, et per consequens illa in quae resolvitur. Sed differentia media non includit quiditative differentiam ultimam. Ergo non potest in illam resolveri. Praeterea  
485 secundum ipsum ens divisione quiditative sufficienter dividitur in ens increatum et in decem genera et in partes essentielles decem generum. Sed differentia media includit ens quiditative per te. Ergo differentia media vel est aliquod decem generum, quod est absurdum, vel alicuius ipsorum pars essentialis, quod similiter est absonum.

490 Dices quod est pars essentialis alicuius speciei.

Contra: ultima differentia est pars essentialis speciei, ergo includit quiditative ens, quod negat. Unde oportet quod vocet partes essentielles materiam et formam, quae quidem sunt duae naturae distinctae.

Contra: non omne genus habet materiam et formam. Patet in generibus  
495 accidentium. Sed ipse dicit 'partes essentielles decem generum'. Respondeo: sufficit pro verificatione propositionis suae quod materia et forma sint partes alicuius generis, aut si liceret vocare partes subiectivas partes essentielles, pateret evidentius dictum eius.

Praeterea Scotus *Super VII Metaphysicae* q.17 in solutione secundi argumenti  
500 ad principale dicit sic: 'omnis differentia quae solum est differentia se tota est

473-474 *ibid.* n.158 (Vat. 3.96:17-97:4). 478 'eius', sc. Scoti. Vide *ibid.* n.132 (Vat. 3.81-82); supra, ll. 434-435. 480 'dicens', sc. scotizans. 480-481 *ibid.* n.133 (Vat. 3.82-83); supra, ll. 435-442. 485 'ipsum', sc. Scotum. Vide 1 *Ord.* d.3 n.135 (Vat. 3.84). 495 'ipse', sc. Scotus. Vide supra, l. 486. 500-503 *QQ Metaph.* 7.17 n.3 (Vivès 7.451b).

473 similiter] simpliciter V: om. O dicit om. O 474 quod om. OVW 476 persuadeo V 477 in quid om. O ipse om. V 478 quod] si add. V 479 procedetur V 482 totum] compositum add. O 482-484 includere...quiditative om. sed media (l. 483)...quiditative (l. 484) in marg. sup. suppl. N 484 illam] illa VW 485 increatum] creatum V 488 absurdum] obscurum W pars] patet N 488-490 quod...essentialis om. per hom. N 488 similiter] simpliciter W 489 absonum] absurdum O 490 essentialis om. O 491 Contra] si interl. add. V: ista add. N: ita add. W essentialis] alicuius O 492 vocet] -ces O: notet W 493 distinctae om. O 495 Sed om. V essentielles om. O Respondeo] istorum V 497 pateret] faceret V evidenter O 499 Super om. N 500 toto NW

diversa, et omnis talis est praedicatum primum, ita quod non est praedicatum quod sit de intellectu alicuius differentiae, aut quod sit prius aliqua differentia. Unde duae differentiae nihil habent commune praedicatum de eis in quid per se primo modo.' Haec sunt verba eius quibus nihil evidentius dici potest ad propositum nostrum.

505 Praeterea si ipse loquitur de solis ultimis, ut dicit vulgus, aut de solis ultimis specificis, et tunc ens praedicabitur in quid de ultimis quae sunt individuales; aut de solis ultimis individualibus, et tunc ens praedicabitur in quid de ultimis specificis, cuius oppositum dicit. Ergo oportet aliter intelligere.

Praeterea constans est quod rationalitas est ultima differentia specifica. Sed 510 secundum ipsum, si rationalitas sumatur ab aliqua parte essentiali, includit ens quiditative, ita quod haec erit in quid 'rationalitas est ens'. Ergo ultimitas specifica praecise non facit quod ens non praedicetur in quid de differentia.

De secundo, praemitto primo distinctionem talem: ultimitas in differentiis tripliciter potest accipi, quaedam enim est ultimitas determinationis; quaedam 515 specificationis, nam proprie loquendo non omnis determinatio est specifica seu per differentiam specificam; quaedam vero est ultimitas irresolutionis. Secundo ad propositum dico quod prima ultimitas competit soli differentiae individuali, secunda soli differentiae specialissimae, tertia omni differentiae et omni realitati a qua potest sumi differentia, cum sit simpliciter irresolubilis, ut superius est 520 ostensum.

Ex his patet ad primum vulgi tum quia omnis differentia est ultima modo praexposito; tum quia dato quod probaret de ultimis specificis non est formalis illatio 'de istis probat, ergo de omnibus aliis negat'; tum quia ratio prima sua ita probat de omnibus sicut de specificis.

525 Ad secundum: posito quod in aliqua natura sint plures realitates a quibus possint gradatim sumi differentiae, dico quod quaelibet illarum est irresolubilis. Da enim quod prima vel media inter illas sit resolubilis in realitatem entis et aliquam aliam realitatem, quae quidem non potest poni realitas individualis, ut prius deductum est. De illa realitate, quaeram aut est resolubilis aut irresolubilis. Si irresolubilis, 530 habeo propositum. Si resolubilis, proceditur in infinitum. Quaelibet igitur illarum

510 'ipsum', sc. Scotum. Vide 1 *Ord.* d.3 n.159 (Vat. 3.97:11-15); cf. *ibid.* n.160 (Vat. 3.98:13-16). 513 Cf. *supra*, II. 476-477. 519-520 *supra*, II. 204-216. 521 *supra*, II. 471-472. 525 *supra*, II. 472-473. 528-529 *supra*, II. 505-508.

502 sit<sup>2</sup> *om. O* 504 eius *om. O* 505 ultimis] differentiis *add. N* 506 praedicatur  
*O* 506-507 quae...ultimis<sup>2</sup> *om. per hom. V* 507 praedicatur *O* 508 opposita *W*  
509 constat *O* 511 erit] sit *O* 512 ens *om. O* 513 tale *N* 514 potest *om. O*  
516 ultima *N* 517 dico *om. N* competit] -venit *V* 518 tertia] enim *add. O*  
519 sumi *om. O* simpliciter *om. O* 519-520 est ostensum] dictum *O* 521 his *om. O*  
523 ergo *om. V* 523-524 ita probat] improbat *O* 524 sicut] simul *O* 525 possunt  
*O* 526-527 Da...resolubilis *om. O* 527 resolubilis] irresolubilis *W* realitatis *O* et]  
in *add. V* 529-530 Si...habeo] si sic *O: om. W* 530 procedetur *V*

realitatum est irresolubilis, et per consequens ultima. Non tamen a qualibet sumitur ultima differentia specifica, sed solum ab illa quae est ultima in illo ordine, et hoc dicit Doctor.

Ad tertium: sicut patet expresse ex textu suo, supponit opinionem illorum qui dicunt quod aliqua differentia sumitur a parte essentiali, quod tamen non est verum secundum opinionem eius. Et ideo illud quod in ista hypothesis fundatur, scilicet quod ens praedicatur in quid de aliqua differentia, non videtur esse de mente eius.

Contra: illud assignat pro ratione ad probandum quod ens non est genus.

Respondeo: istam rationem assignat ex suppositione istius opinionis, sed aliam assignat secundum mentem propriam, ut in sequenti quaestione patebit. Si quis autem sciat ipsum melius exponere, non invideo, aut si quis velit de eius intentione contendere, sciat quod apud sapientes problema de intentione contensiosum et inutile reputatur.

### <Articulus Tertius: Opinio Aureoli>

Quantum ad tertium, arguit Aureolus contra Scotum sic: effugiens quiditative aliquam rationem, etsi qualitative pertineat ad eam, potest habere differentiae rationem. Sed Philosophus et Commentator dicunt quod ideo ens non est genus nec habet differentias, quia nihil effugit rationem entis. Ergo nihil effugit rationem entis quiditative, alioquin si quiditative effugeret, non qualitative, nihil omnino concluderet Philosophus quod ens differentias non haberet. Maior probatur, quia differentia qualitative se habet ad genus.

Praeterea omne habens 'quid' est ens et aliquid. Sed ultimae differentiae et passiones entis habent quid et quiditative. Ergo necesse est quod sint quiditative

532-533 Cf. 2 *Ord.* d.3 nn.176-86 (Vat. 7.478-83). 534 supra, II. 473-475.  
534-536 Cf. Scotum: 'distinguo de differentiis, quod aliqua potest sumi a parte essentiali ultima...sicut si ponatur pluralitas formarum' (1 *Ord.* d.3 n.159 [Vat. 3.97]); '...in aliquibus creaturis genus et differentia accipiuntur ab alia et alia realitate, sicut ponendo plures formas in homine...' (ibid. d.8 n.106 [Vat. 4.201]); 'Aliter potest dici quod differentia sumitur per se ab actualitate essentialiter perfectiva. Quandoque autem talis est realiter forma...sic Avicembron posuit omni differentiae correspondere propriam formam; quandoque actualitas a qua sumitur differentia non est forma sed perfectio formalis...' (*QQ Metaph.* 7.19 n.13 [Vivès 7.471b]). 538 ibid. d.3 n.160 (Vat. 3.98-99). 545-603 Aureoli, 1 *Scriptum* d.2 sect.9 (ed. Buytaert, 2.495:150-497:232). 547 *Metaph.* 3.3 (998b22-24); t.10 (Iunt. 8.49B-D).

531 realitatum *om. O* 532 hoc] sic *O* 534 tertium] secundum *V* textu] intellectus  
*O* supponit] ibi *add. NW* illorum] aliorum *O* 535 aliqua *om. O* 536 ideo *om. V*  
illud] quidquid *O* 537 videtur esse] est *O* 538 illud] est quod *add. O* 539 aliam]  
illam *in marg. corr. ex istam V* 540 propria *O* 541 invideo] video *V* 542 sapientes]  
scientes *O* problema] probabile *V* 547 dicunt *om. N* 548-549 Ergo...entis *om. per*  
*hom. W* 550 habet *O* Maior probatur *om. O* 550-551 quia...genus *post rationem* (l.  
547) *transp. O* 552 habens] quod habet *O* ultimae *om. O* 553 entis *om. O* Ergo]  
igitur *O: om. V* est quod] *om. W* quod] ut *O* sint] sunt *O: sit V*

ens et aliquid. Maior probatur, 'quid' enim est interrogativum et 'aliquid' est  
 555 responsivum. Interrogativum autem aequatur responsivo et e converso. Omne  
 igitur 'quid' est aliquid. Sed aliquid et ens convertuntur. Ergo omne habens 'quid'  
 est ens et aliquid. Minor probatur, quia alias illa non distinguerentur quiditative,  
 ut ponitur, nisi essent in se quid.

Praeterea omne scibile est quid et ens. Sed clarum est quod rationes formales  
 560 differentiarum et passionum entis sunt vere scibiles. Ergo vere sunt quid et ens et  
 aliquid. Maior probatur, quia Philosophus dicit vii *Metaphysicae* quod scientia quid  
 in unoquoque est principalius quam scientia alicuius alterius circa illud.

Praeterea omne per se et praecise obiectum intellectus participat per se et  
 quiditative et non denominative rationem entis. Sed differentiae et passiones entis  
 565 sunt praecise comprehensibiles per intellectum, et definibilia sine ratione entis.  
 Ergo continentur quiditative sub ratione entis. Maior probatur, quod enim deno-  
 minative participat rationem obiectivam alicuius potentiae, non comprehenditur  
 per se ab illa potentia, sicut patet quod Diarii filius, quia denominative est  
 coloratus, et non est quiditative color, ideo comprehenditur per accidens a visu  
 570 cuius obiectum est color. Illud igitur quod non per accidens sed per se et praecise  
 comprehenditur ab intellectu, necessario continetur quiditative et non denomina-  
 tive sub ente, quod est obiectum intellectus secundum eos.

Confirmatur nam implicatur contradictio in his dictis, scilicet quod ens sit  
 obiectum formale intellectus, et quod praecise concipiantur et definiantur huius-  
 575 modi rationes ab intellectu, et tamen quod non participant quiditative rationem  
 entis. Hoc enim non est aliud dicere, nisi quod intellectus fertur in aliquid, ubi non  
 reperit suam rationem formalem obiecti, cum exclusa ratione entis definiat  
 huiusmodi rationes.

Praeterea conceptus dubius et certus non est idem conceptus secundum eos. Sed  
 580 de passionibus entis et differentiis possum esse certus quod sunt aliquid, dubius

561 *Metaph.* 7.1 t.4 (1028a35-b1). 568 Cf. *De an.* 2.6 t.65 (418a20-25). 572 'eos',  
 sc. Scotum. Vide 1 *Ord.* d.3 n.137 (Vat. 3.85-86). 579 *ibid.* nn.27-28, 138 (Vat. 3.18, 86);  
 cf. Alnwick (ed. Dumont, p. 47.341-352).

554 aliquid<sup>1</sup>] quid *O* Maior] quod *O* 554-556 probatur...aliquid *post* aliquid (l. 552)  
*transp. O* 554 est<sup>2</sup> *om. V* 555 Interrogativum] -tivo *W*; -tio *V* autem] enim *O*: quae  
*W*: *om. N* aequatur] aequiparatur *N*: aequaliter *V* responsivo] -sio *NVW* 557 et *om.*  
*V* Minor probatur *om. O* 557-558 quia...quid *post* quiditative (l. 553) *transp. O* non  
*om. V* distinguerentur] different *O* 558 ut ponitur *om. O* nisi] nec *O* quid] aliquid  
*N* 561 dicit *om. N* 562 principalis] praedicamentali *O* alterius] alicuius *N* 563,  
 565 praecise] per se *O* 565 et] etiam *V* definibilia] discibilia *V* 567 comprehenditur]  
 apprehenditur *V* 569 est *om. O* comprehenditur] apprehenditur *W* 570 quod *om. O*  
 non] est *add. N* praecise] per se *O* 571 continetur] comprehenditur *V* 573 his]  
 ens *O* 574 obiectum] subiectum *W* quod *om. V*: con- et exp. *W* concipiat *VW*  
 definiatur *W* 575 et *om. V* tamen quod] tum quia *V* participet *O* 576 dicere]  
 differentiae *V* fertur] infertur *V* 577 formalis *O* definiat] -ant *O* 580 esse] dubius  
 et *add. O* sunt] sint *NO*

autem in speciali quid sint. Ergo conceptus 'aliquid' communis omnibus istis est alius a conceptibus propriis. Constat autem quod conceptus ille importatus per aliquid non est aliud a conceptu entis. Ergo idem quod prius. Minor probatur, quia certi sumus quod ratio bonitatis est aliquid, et tamen ignoramus, vel ad minus in  
585 quaestione ponimus, utrum sint res vel formalitates tantum, et utrum sint respectus vel absolutae rationes.

Praeterea illud quod clauditur infra conceptum 'omnis', clauditur infra conceptum entis. Sed clarum est quod differentiae et passionis entis clauduntur infra 'omne'. Ergo clauduntur infra conceptum entis. Maior probatur, 'omne' enim est  
590 signum universale distribuens ens. Unde exponitur 'omne' per 'omne ens' et per 'omnem rem'. Minor etiam probatur quia si sint extra omnia, vadant viam suam.

Praeterea impossibile est passionem reperiri sine ratione propria sui subiecti, alias non esset passio adaequata illi rationi. Sed distinctio est una de passionibus entis. Ergo impossibile est quod aliqua fundent distinctionem nisi per rationem  
595 entis. Sed formalitates istae secundum sic ponentes sunt fundamenta distinctionis, quoniam se ipsis formaliter distinguuntur omni alio circumscripto. Ergo in ipsis circumscripto omni alio est ratio entis. Includunt igitur rationem entis, non tanquam aliam a se, et per consequens non denominative.

Praeterea inter contradictoria non est dare medium. Sed ista sunt contradictoria:  
600 differentiae sunt aliquid formaliter et differentiae non sunt aliquid formaliter. Ergo inter istas non est dare medium. Si ergo differentiae sunt aliquid formaliter, habetur propositum. Si vero non sunt aliquid formaliter, vadant viam suam. Haec est impugnatio fideliter.

### <Ad Rationes Aureoli>

605 Ad primum: deficit multipliciter. Primo in maiori, quae est 'effugiens quiditative aliquam rationem, etsi qualitative pertineat ad eam, potest habere differentiae

605 supra, II. 545-551.

581 autem *om. O* sint] sit *V* 581-582 aliquid...alius] omnis aliud *O* 581 istis *om. W* 582 Constat *in marg. corr. ex conceptus N* conceptus ille] iste *O* 583 aliud] alius  
*V* 584 ad] aliud *W* 585 sint<sup>1, 2</sup>] sunt *O* vel] quaestione vel *add. O* respectus]  
respectus *O*: res *V* 586 vel *om. O* 588 entis<sup>2</sup> *om. V* 589 omne<sup>1</sup>] -nem *N* entis  
*om. O* omne<sup>2</sup>] esse *W* enim] quod *add. N* 590 ens<sup>1</sup> *om. O* exponitur] pro *add. N*  
*N* omne<sup>2</sup>] esse *N* per<sup>2</sup> *om. O* 591 suam] ergo clauduntur infra conceptum entis *add. O*  
*O* 592 reperiri *om. O* 593 rationem *O* 594 fundent] -dant *O*: -detur *W*  
595 secundum *om. N* fundamenta] -datae *V* distinctionis] et differentiae *add. O*  
598 aliam] aliud *O* 599 est *om. O* contradictoria] ultimae *add. O* 600 et] ultimae *add. O*  
*O* et...formaliter<sup>2</sup>] et differentiae sunt *in marg. N: om. VW* 601 ista *O* dari *O*  
602 vero] ergo *V* formaliter *om. NW* est *om. N* 605 multipliciter] in materia *O*  
quae] quod *V* 606 habere] haec *O*

rationem'. Sed color effugit quiditative rationem substantiae corporeae et pertinet ad substantiam corpoream qualitative, cum ipsam qualificet et denominet. Ergo color potest esse differentia substantiae corporeae, quod est falsum. Ergo altera  
610 praemissarum. Non minor, ergo maior.

Praeterea passio effugit rationem quiditativam subiecti. Ergo propria passio potest esse differentia subiecti.

Secundo in probatione maioris, non est enim formalis illatio 'differentia qualitative se habet ad genus, ergo omne quod se habet qualitative ad aliquid potest esse  
615 differentia eius', immo est fallacia consequentis.

Tertio in assumptione minoris, nam Philosophus non ponit quod nihil effugit rationem entis, sed ponit istam litteram: 'necesse differentias cuiuslibet generis esse et unam esse quamlibet'. Et hoc nos concedimus sane intelligendo.

Quarto in illatione, non sequitur enim 'nihil effugit rationem entis, ergo nihil  
620 rationem entis effugit quiditative', cum procedatur a pluribus causis indeterminatis ad unam determinatam vel a superiori ad inferius affirmando. Nam effugere rationem entis est superius ad effugere rationem entis quiditative et denominative.

Quinto in conclusionis affirmatione, quia facta hypothesi adhuc concluderet ratio Philosophi, nam Philosophus intendit ibi probare quod ens non est genus.  
625 Et ad hoc secundum Commentatorem innuit talem rationem: 'impossibile est quod aliquid praedicetur praedicatione generis de rebus habentibus formas diversas, quae non communicant in una forma numero, nam genus non praedicatur nisi de formis, quae communicant in una forma numero'. Haec sunt verba Commentatoris. Sed ens praedicatur de rebus habentibus formas diversas quae non communicant in una  
630 forma numero, puta de decem praedicamentis. 'Ens enim' ut dicit ibidem Commentator 'dictum de eis non notificat de eis unam naturam cum naturae eorum sint diversae'. Ergo impossibile est ens praedicari praedicatione generis et per consequens ens genus esse non potest.

617-618 *Metaph.* 3.3 t.10 (998b21-25). 623-624 *supra*, I. 547. 625-628 *In Metaph.* 3 t.10 (Iunt. 8.49b-c). 630-632 *ibid.* (Iunt. 8.49b).

607 color] calor *W* corporeae] incorporeae *V* 607-609 et...corporeae *om. per hom. et fort. in marg. suppl. N* 608 qualificet] calificet *W* 611 quiditativam] -tive *V* 612 subiecti] sui *add. NO* 613 enim] *om. NO* 614 ad<sup>1</sup> *om. W* quod se habet] se habens *O* aliquid] genus *O* 616 tertia *W* minoris] univocationis *O*: unionis *W* 618 esse *om. N* intelligendo] intendendo *V* 620 proceditur *O* a *om. NW* 621 determinatam] -tionem *W* a superiori] ad superiora *W* 622 superius] secundo supponi *V* superius...entis<sup>2</sup>] dupliciter scilicet *O* effugere] -git *W* 623 affirmatione *mut. in confirmatione N* adhuc] ad hoc *N* concluderem *V*: -det *N* 624 rationem *V* ens] entis *V* 625 Et *om. O* innuit] et inducit *V* quod] ut *N* 626 habentibus] secundum *V* 627-628 nam...numero *om. per hom. N* 627-630 nam...numero *om. per hom. V* 630 ibidem] idem *V*

Ad secundum: aliter dicendum de passionibus et aliter de differentiis quantum  
 635 ad illud quod est dicere quid, nam passionibus entis dicunt quid solum denominative,  
 quia conceptum quiditativum entis denominant, sed differentiae dicunt quid  
 denominative determinative et constitutive, non tamen formaliter. Et hoc videtur  
 significare Augustinus in *Logica* sua: differentia est virtute quid, dictione quale,  
 significatione mixtum.

640 Ad formam, cum dicitur omne habens quid est ens et aliquid, concedo quod eo  
 modo quo habet quid, est ens et aliquid, ita quod si habet quid quiditative, est ens  
 quiditative; si qualitative, qualitative.

Ad minorem: concedo quod illa habent quid modo praeexposito.

Ad probationem: quaecumque differunt quiditative sunt in se quid per te. Sed  
 645 ens et nihil distinguuntur quiditative. Ergo nihil in se est quid, quod est oppositum  
 in adiecto. Concedi tamen potest quod quodlibet istorum habet in se quid, tamen  
 alio et alio modo, ut saepe dictum est.

Aliter quid dupliciter potest accipi: uno modo pro essentia; alio modo pro omni  
 ratione formali obicibili intellectui. Primo modo sola illa quae includunt ens  
 650 quiditative habent formaliter quid. Secundo modo omnis ratio in re inventa potest  
 dici quid, sive illa sit denominativa sive determinativa. Et sic concedo quod tam  
 passionibus quam differentiae habent propria quid et proprios conceptus quiditativos,  
 sed earum conceptus quiditativus est praecise qualitativus, cum ipsarum quid sit  
 esse illud quo aliquid est tale aut tale, puta unum aut verum quantum ad passionibus,  
 655 corporeum aut incorporeum quantum ad differentias.

Ad tertium: concedo quod omne scibile est quid et ens aliquo modo, et similiter  
 concedo conclusionem modo exposito.

Ad quartum dicendum secundum Scotum quod omne per se intelligibile aut  
 includit essentialiter rationem entis, aut continetur virtualiter vel essentialiter in  
 660 includente essentialiter rationem entis. Omnia enim genera et species et individua

634 supra, ll. 552-558. 638 *Anonymi Paraphrasis Themistiana* (Pseudo-Augustini *Categoriae*  
*decem*) (ArL 1/1-5.148:23-25). 644 'per te', sc. Aureoli. 656 supra, ll. 559-562.

658 supra, ll. 563-572. 658-663 1 *Ord.* d.3 n.137 (Vat. 3.85).

634 aliter] est *add.* *O* dicendum] aliter *add.* *O* 635 illud] id *W* 636-637 quia...de-  
 nominative *om.* per *hom.* *N* 637 et<sup>1</sup> *om.* *V*: denominative et *add.* *O* 638 significare]  
 assignare *V* sua] dicens *add.* *N* 639 significatione] -cative *N* mixta *V* 640 cum  
 dicitur] conceditur *O* 641 quo] quod *VW*: *om.* *O* quid<sup>2</sup>] ens *bis* *O* quiditative] -tivo  
*W* est<sup>2</sup> *om.* *O* 642 si] sed *W* qualitative *om.* *O* 643 illa *om.* *O* 644 differunt  
 quiditative] distinguuntur *V* 646 in<sup>1</sup>] et *W* quilibet illorum *V* 647 est *om.* *O*  
 648 pro<sup>1</sup>] quod *W* 649 formali] distincte *add.* *N* solum *O* 650 modo *om.* *V* re]  
 se *NV* 651 quid *om.* *O* sive<sup>2</sup>] sit *add.* *N* 652 propriam *N* 653 sed] secundum *V*  
 eorum *NV* quiditativus] -vos *V* ipsarum] ipsorum *V*: earum *O* sit] si *V*  
 654 esse] omne *O* quo] quod *V* aliquid] addit *V* aut] vel plura *O*: *om.* *V*  
 656 tertiam *N*: secundam *W* omne] esse *W* 657 exposito] praeexposito *W* 658 quar-  
 tum] -tam *N* 659-660 aut...entis *om.* per *hom.* *W* 659 in *om.* *N* 660 includente  
 essentialiter *om.* *V* et<sup>1</sup>] vel *O* et<sup>2</sup>] *om.* *W*



et omnes partes essentielles ipsorum et ens increatum includunt ens quiditative. Omnes differentiae includuntur in aliquibus istorum essentialiter. Omnes passioness  
entis includuntur virtualiter in ente et in suis inferioribus.

Ad formam, cum dicitur 'omne per se et praecise obiectum intellectus', quaero  
665 quid intelligis per 'per se et praecise'. Aut intelligis per se primo, et tunc propositio  
indubitabiliter est vera. Aut intelligis per se et distincte, et tunc propositio adhuc  
est vera, si ens esset primum et adaequatum obiectum intellectus nostri propter  
communitatem in quid ad omne per se intelligibile, sicut ponitur lux vel color ad  
omne per se visibile. Nunc autem non est ita, cum impossibile sit, ut visum est, ens  
670 in quid de omnibus praedicari. Et ideo nego illam propositionem sic universaliter  
acceptam.

Ad probationem: maior est vera nisi illud denominative participans includatur  
virtualiter in obiecto et in contentis sub ipso, vel includatur essentialiter in aliquo  
includente essentialiter rationem obiecti, quod non potest dici de filio domini  
675 Diarii, quia nec virtualiter includitur in colore et sub ipso contentis, nec includitur  
essentialiter in aliquo includente essentialiter colorem.

Ad confirmationem: patet ex dictis quod non implicatur contradictio. Non enim  
ponitur quod ens sit obiectum formale intellectus propter communitatem in quid  
ad omne de se intelligibile, et ideo non oportet quod ratio formalis entis reperiatur  
680 in quolibet per se intelligibili.

Ad quantum dicendum secundum Scotum quod nullus conceptus simpliciter  
simplex potest secundum aliquid concipi et secundum aliquid ignorari. Et ideo  
dicit Philosophus ix *Metaphysicae* in fine quod circa simpliciter simplicia non est  
deceptio, vel enim totaliter attinguntur, vel non attinguntur, et tunc penitus  
685 ignoratur. Ex quo patet quod de nullo conceptu simpliciter simplici potest esse  
certitudo secundum aliquid eius et dubitatio secundum aliud, tunc enim non esset  
simpliciter simplex.

Ad formam: nego minorem, quia conceptus tam passionum quam differentiarum  
sunt simpliciter simplices, ut prius ostensum est.

677 supra, ll. 573-578.      681 supra, ll. 579-586.      681-687 ibid. n.147 (Vat. 3.91-92).

661 includit *NV*      662 in aliquibus *om. O*      663 entis *om. O*      664 cum dicitur]  
conceditur *O*      per se et *om. N*      praecise] per se *O*      665 per<sup>1</sup> *om. O*      praecise] per<sup>2</sup>  
se et del.? *O*      intelligis] intentionis *W*      666 per se *om. V*      667 est] esset *V: om. W*  
ens *om. O*      nostri *om. O*      668 se *om. O*      ponitur] probatur *O*      669 impossibile]  
possibile *N*      ut visum] unum *O*      670 in quid *om. O*      671 acceptam] conceptam *V*  
672 maioris *N*      674 filia *W*      domini *om. O*      675 sub] de *W*      676 in] colore et de  
ipso contentis *add. W*      679 entis *om. O*      680 intelligibili] -ligi *N*      681 secundum *om. O*  
*O*      683 circa] essentia *V*      684 enim] id est *V*      tunc] tam *V: causat W: causatur O*  
penitus *om. O*      685 ignoratur] -rantia *O*      de nullo] dicendo de *V*      686 eius *om. O*  
688-689 Ad...est *om. W*      689 est *om. O*

- 690 Ad probationem: ista propositio 'bonitas est aliquid' non est absolute concedenda, cum sit multiplex. Nam potest intelligi vel identice vel denominative et sic est vera, vel formaliter et sic non est vera. De non vero autem nullus potest esse certus. Et ideo qui illas dubitationes habet de bonitate vel de aliqua alia passione entis penitus ipsam ignorat.
- 695 Aliter detur quod conceptus 'aliquid' sit alius ab omnibus istis.
- Si inferatur 'ergo dicitur in quid de omnibus istis' (unde loquuntur contra 'est alius per te et communis ex hypothesi, ergo praedicatur in quid'), respondeo: conceptus differentiae specificae est alius a conceptibus individuorum sub illa specie contentorum et est communis illis. Ergo praedicatur in quid de ipsis, quod 700 falsum est.
- Ad formam dico quod non omne quocumque modo commune praedicatur in quid, quia non illud quod est commune ut denominabile denominativis et determinabile determinativis, quia tunc genus praedicaretur de differentia in quid.
- Ad sextum diceretur forte quod cum dicitur 'omne' absolute, aut intelligitur fieri 705 distributio pro omnibus suppositis, et sic concederetur illa maior; aut intelligitur fieri non solum pro suppositis sed etiam pro omnibus rationibus formalibus quorumcumque, et sic negaretur.
- Ad probationem diceretur quod 'omne' non solum exponitur per 'omne ens' et per 'omnem rem', sed etiam per 'omnem rationem realem'.
- 710 Contra: tunc enim sequeretur quod aliquid esset communius ente distribuibile per hoc signum 'omne', quod falsum est. Ideo reduco rationem contra auctorem eius sic: nullus terminus est proprie distribuibilis nisi univocus sit, nam distributio praesupponit unam rationem in pluribus repertam. Unde termino aequivoco non proprie additur signum distributivum. Sed ens distribuitur proprie per hoc signum 715 'omne' per te. Ergo ens est univocum, quod est contra te.

704 supra, II. 587-591. 715 'per te', sc. Aureoli, qui conceptum entis esse univocum negat. Cf. 1 *Scriptum* d.2 sect.9 nn.51-53 (ed. Buytaert, 2.484-85).

690 propositio] probatio *O* 691 identice] -tate *V*: -tatem *W* vel<sup>1-2</sup> *om. W* 693 illas] alias *ut vid. O* habet *om. O* de<sup>2</sup> *om. NW* passionum *W* 693-694 passione entis] enti si passione *N* 695 datur *N* sit alius] est aliud *O* 696 loquuntur] loquitur communiter *V*: loquitur *N* 697 alius] angelus *W* communis] -mentatoris *W* quid] quia illud quod est commune ut denominabile *add. et est...denominabile exp. O* responde *W* 698 specificae *om. O* conceptibus] -tu *W* 699 est...communis] eis communis *O* de ipsis *om. O* 702 non] est *add. W* non illud *om. W* ut *om. O* et *om. NVW* 703 denominativis] vel denominative denominativis *add. O* differentia] -tiis *O* 704 diceretur] -cetur *W* omne] aliquid *corr. ex esse N* 706 pro<sup>1</sup>] illis *add. O* 707 sic] non *add. VW* 708 diceretur] -cetur *O* 708-709 et...rem *om. O* 709 rationem] rem *O* 710 enim *om. O* 711 est *om. W* auctorem] auctoritatem *V* 712 nullus *om. W* distribuibilis] -bui *W* sit *om. O* 713 in] a *V* termino] ideo *O*

Sciendum tamen quod ens dupliciter potest intelligi distribui: uno modo praecise pro suis inferioribus; alio modo pro omnibus in ipso et in suis inferioribus virtualiter contentis, et pro omnibus essentialiter inclusis in illis quae essentialiter ens includunt. Prima distributio est per se, et secunda per concomitantiam.

720 Ad formam: concedo quod illud quod includitur infra distributionem 'omnis' per se clauditur infra conceptum entis per se, et concomitative per concomitantiam. Dixi autem 'infra distributionem' quia non videtur proprie dici 'infra conceptum omnis', nam proprius conceptus omnis est quaedam secunda intentio, sed infra secundam intentionem non clauditur prima intentio.

725 Ad minorem: concedo quod passionem entis et differentiae clauduntur infra distributionem omnis per concomitantiam, et ideo non oportet eas laborare in via. Non sequitur igitur quod 'per se et quiditative claudantur infra conceptum entis'.

Ad septimum: ens in communi secundum istum nullam habet propriam passionem. Sed distinctio est propria passio entis ut assumit hic in minori. Ergo ens  
730 nullam habet propriam passionem et aliquam habet propriam passionem, quod non videtur conveniens.

Dicendum igitur primo quod aliquae propriae passionem entis per suam nimiam communitatem circumincedunt se ipsas et denominant. Unde dicitur unitas bona et vera, et veritas bona et una, et bonitas una et vera. Similiter ens circumincedit  
735 omnes istas passionem, nam quaelibet ipsarum est ens et ipsae circumincedunt ens, nam ens est unum verum et bonum. Praedicta autem circumincessio non est quiditative, sed cuiusdam mutuae intimitatis et denominationis. Secundo, quod non est inconveniens quod una passio conveniat subiecto mediante alia. Unitas autem est proximum fundamentum distinctionis et identitatis, nam unitas est illud  
740 quo aliquid est in se indistinctum et distinctum ab alio. Distinctio igitur consequitur ens mediante unitate. Tertio, quod omne illud quod potest ab unitate denominari

728 supra, ll. 592-598. 733 De 'circumincessione' sive 'in-exsistentia', cf. Scotum, 1 *Ord.* d.19 q.2 (Vat. 5.280-303).

716 Sciendum tamen] dicendum *N* quod *om.* *O* 717 alio modo] secundo *O*: sed *W*: non solum pro suis inferioribus sed *add. N* 718 inclusis] et *add. V* 719 per se et *om.* *O* et secunda] -do *N*: -dum *W* per concomitantiam] pro concomitantibus *O* 720 includitur] clauditur *N* 721 clauditur] includitur *O* et] vel *W*: quod *add. NO* concomitative] -tatur *O* 722 dici] esse *O* 724 prima] secunda *N* 726 eas] eos *NO* 727 quod *om.* *V* quiditative] *N* clauduntur *O*: -deretur *N* 728 istam *O* 729-730 Sed...passionem<sup>1</sup> *om.* per *hom.* *W* 729 propria] una *O* minori] maiori *V* 730 et...passionem<sup>2</sup> *om.* *O* 732 propriae] propter *add. O* per] propter *N* suam *om.* *V* nimiam] minimam *N* 733 circumincedunt] incedunt *V*: circumincedunt *O*: circumdederunt *N* Unde dicitur *om.* *V* unitas] est *add. O* 734 et<sup>2</sup> *om.* *O* veritas] est *add. O* veritas...una<sup>1</sup>] unitas vera et bona *N*: *om.* *W* bonitas] bona *bis O* circumincedit] -incidit *O* 736 unum] et *add. V* 737 cuiusdam] cuiuslibet *O* 739 autem] enim *O* 740 indistinctum] distinctum *V* sequitur *O*

potest esse subiectum distinctionis. Unde tam ipsa entitas quam veritas et bonitas huiusmodi, cum possint ab unitate denominari, possunt esse subiecta distinctionis.

Contra: ergo distinctio non erit passio magis entis quam ipsarum passionum  
745 entis.

Praeterea illae passionem, cum habeant conceptus simpliciter simplices, se ipsis distinguuntur ab invicem et ab ente. Ergo non per unitatem.

Confirmatur, quia non per unitatem distinguetur quaelibet ipsarum.

Ad primum: distinctio dicitur esse potius passio entis, tum quia ratio entis habet  
750 prius rationem subiecti quam aliqua aliarum, tum quia ratio entis virtualiter continet tam unitatem quam alias passionem.

Ad secundum: concedo quod illa se ipsis distinguuntur fundamentaliter, et per unitatem causaliter, et ipsa distinctione formaliter. Et hoc magis declarabitur in *Quaestionibus de modis distinctionum*.

755 Ad confirmationem: quaelibet illarum se ipsa fundamentaliter distinguitur ab unitate, et tamen proxima ratio distinctionis est unitas, a qua denominabilis est tam ipsa unitas quam quaelibet aliarum. Sunt autem in materia illorum transcendentium tria semper necessario retinenda, scilicet mutua intimitas suarum rationum formalium, proprietas, et ipsorum mutua denominabilitas. Ex primo sequitur circumscriptionis unius impossibilitas ab alio; ex secundo ipsorum ab invicem distinguibilitas; ex tertio quaedam denominativa circularitas, propter quorum ignorantiam decipiuntur plerique volentes de rationibus specialibus et de rationibus transcendentibus uniformiter iudicare.

Ad formam: detur maior. Ad cuius tamen evidentiam est sciendum quod  
765 aliquando propria et quiditativa ratio subiecti est immediata ratio vel causa passionis, aliquando una passio est immediata causa vel ratio alterius passionis.

Ad minorem: <concedo> quod distinctio est passio entis, mediante tamen unitate quam immediatius respicit quam ipsum ens, propter quod non solum entis sed etiam unius passio potest dici. Unde Philosophus IV *Metaphysicae* enumeratis

754 *De modis distinctionum* q.10 'Utrum distinctio ut est ad genus et differentiam et diversitatem dicat aliquid positivum formaliter' (O 58v-60v). Eadem quaestio etiam habetur in Petri Thomae *Quodlibet* q.7 (ed. Hooper-Buytaert, pp. x-xii, 118-31). 764 supra, II. 592-593. 769 *Metaph.* 4.2 t.5 (1004b1-8).

742 veritas et bonitas]	unitas O	bonitas]	et add. NV	743 cum possint]	possunt O
subiecta]	-tum V	744 erit]	est OV	quam]	quod NV
entis add. O	748 quia non]	quando NW:	quoniam si O	distinguentur V	749 potius
om. V	tum om. O	750 prius]	propriam O: proprie N	subiecta W	751 continet
om. V	752 secundum]	aliud V	illa]	quae add. V: ita W	distinguantur W
ipsa om. V	756 proxima]	propria N	tam]	tamen O	757 in materia]
illarum]	ipsorum O: illarum N: istarum V	759-760 primo...alio om. O	760 ipsarum W		
762 plerique]	plurimum O	volentes]	-tibus V: volentes? O	764 formam]	argumenti septimi
add. V	tamen om. V	768 quod om. O	solum]	est passio add. O	

770 aliquibus passionibus entis, inter quas enumerat idem et diversum, dicit quod unius inquantum est unum, et entis inquantum est ens, eadem secundum se passiones sunt. Quia ergo cuilibet passioni et cuilibet differentiae incircumscribibiliter est unitas intima, et quaelibet ab unitate denominabilis est, quaelibet illarum potest esse fundamentum distinctionis.

775 Ad octavum: concedo quod nec passiones nec differentiae sunt aliquid formaliter vel quiditative. Et cum dicitur 'ergo vadant suam viam', dicendum quod ad impossibile nemo cogi debet. Praedictae autem passiones et differentiae pedes non habent et per consequens viare non possunt.

Dices hic 'per te non sunt aliquid formaliter, ergo sunt formaliter nihil'.

780 Respondeo: nego consequentiam, nam si illa tenet arguam sic: homo non est formaliter asinus, ergo est formaliter non asinus, quod falsum est, tunc enim aliqua negatio esset de conceptu formali ipsius hominis.

Praeterea ad negativam de praedicato finito seu affirmato non sequitur affirmativa de praedicato infinito seu negato ex II *Perihermeneias*. Sed haec propositio  
785 'passio vel differentia non est formaliter aliquid' est negativa de praedicato affirmato, et illa 'passio vel differentia est formaliter nihil' est affirmativa de praedicato negato, 'nihil' enim et 'non aliquid' aequipollent. Ergo secunda non sequitur ad primam.

#### <AD PRINCIPALIA>

790 Ad primum principale respondet Scotus *Super primum sententiarum* quod 'ille conceptus de quo est certitudo est alius ab illis de quibus est dubitatio. Et si ille conceptus salvatur idem cum altero illorum, vere est univocus, sed non oportet quod insit utrique illorum in quid, sed quod vel sit univocus dictus in quid, vel

775 supra, II. 599-603. 779 'per te', sc. Petrum Thomae. 780-782 Cf. Scotum, 1 *Lect.* d.3 n.123 (Vat. 16.272-73). 783-784 Ista regula ad litteram non invenitur in Aristotelis *De interpretatione*. Cf. *Int.* c.10 (19b18-23); Boethius, *In librum Aristotelis Perihermeneias editio secunda*, ed. Karl Meiser, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1877), 2.285:7-19; Scotus, 1 *Ord.* d.21 n.11 (Vat. 5.327-28); d.27 n.1 (Vat. 6.107-108). 790 supra, II. 5-13. 790-798 1 *Ord.* d.3 nn.149-50 (Vat. 3.92-93).

770 inter] in *N* quam numerat *O* 771 entis] certis *N* est ens *om.* *O* eadem *VW*  
secundum] per *NO* 772 cuilibet] et *add.* *V* incircumscribibiliter] -bili *V* 773 illa-  
rum] illam *O* 775 octavum] quartum *N* 776 vadant] -dunt *O* 777 et] nec *W*  
778 per consequens] ideo *V* viare] viam ire *N* 779 hic] ergo *O* per te *om.* *V* nihil  
*om.* *O* 780 si illa tenet *om.* *V* 781 asinus *om.* *O* 783 negativam] -tionem *V*  
praedicato] utroque *NV* finito] -ta seu *om.* *O* affirmato] -ta *V* 783-784 affir-  
mato...seu *om.* per *hom.* *N* affirmativa] -tio *V* 784 praedicato] -camenta *W* 785 aliquid  
*om.* *O* est<sup>2</sup>] ex *V* de *om.* *W*; et *O* praedicato] utroque *NV* 786 affirmato] -tioni  
*V* et *om.* *VW* illa] ita *O* est<sup>2</sup>] de *N* 787 secunda non] secundum ante *N*  
790 ille] est *V* 791 dubitatio] demonstratio *O* 792 altero] alteruter *N* vere *del.* *O*  
793 illorum *om.* *O* sed *om.* *V* vel<sup>1</sup> *om.* *N* 793-794 vel univocus *om.* *V*

univocus ut determinabilis ad determinantes vel ut denominabilis ad denominantes.

795 Unde breviter, ens est univocum omnibus, sed conceptibus non simpliciter simplicibus est univocum dictum in quid de eis; simpliciter simplicibus est univocum vel ut denominabile vel ut determinabile, non autem ut dictum de eis in quid, quia hoc includit contradictionem'. Haec Scotus.

Aliter secundum eundem potest dici quod philosophi non erant certi quod  
800 differentia esset ens quiditative, sed quasi praedicatione per accidens.

Aliter potest responderi ad istud, sicut ad quoddam aliud praedictae impugnationis, quod est quasi idem.

Ad secundum, cum dicitur rationalitas est entitas aut intelligis conceptum rationalitatis esse eundem conceptum entitatis praecise, et tunc erit idem dicere  
805 rationalitas est entitas et rationalitas est rationalitas, aut intelligis conceptum rationalitatis addere aliquid super conceptum entitatis. Illud additum per te non potest esse aliquid positivum. Ergo rationalitas super conceptum entitatis addit conceptum aliquem proprium negativum. Tunc sic: praedicatio extremi contradictionis de extremo est impossibilis. Sed praedicatio entitatis de rationalitate est  
810 huiusmodi, nam entitas est unum extremum contradictionis et pura negatio <aliud>, quae est propria ratio rationalitatis ex hypothesi. Ergo praedicatio entitatis de rationalitate est impossibilis.

Ideo dupliciter potest responderi: uno modo negando minorem. Ad probationem cum dicitur rationalitas non est nihileitas, negatur consequentia, nam ut  
815 habetur in principio II *Perihermeneias* ad negativam de praedicato negato non sequitur affirmativa de praedicato affirmato. Unde ad istam 'homo non est non iustus' non sequitur ista 'homo est iustus'.

Contra: dictum Philosophi non tenet posita constantia subiecti secundum expositores, sed hic supponitur constantia subiecti, scilicet rationalitatis.

799-800 *ibid.* n.147 (Vat. 3.91). 803 *supra*, ll. 14-17. 806 'per te', sc. Alnwick: '...ens per nullas differentias positivas descendit in sua inferiora' (ed. Dumont, p. 61.739-740); '...per nullum positivum additum descendit in haec' (*ibid.* 61.750-751). 815 Cf. *supra*, ll. 783-784. 818-819 Id est, a loco ex contrariis ad negativam sequitur affirmativa posita constantia sive existentia subiecti: Lambert of Auxerre, *Logica* (*Summa Lamberti*), ed. Franco Alessio (Florence, 1971), p. 134 et seq.; Charles H. Lohr et al., 'William of Sherwood, *Introductiones in Logicam*:

794 denominabilis] determinabilis W denominantes] determinantes O 795 breviter] videtur O 796 eis] similiter add. N simplicibus om. V 797 ut<sup>1</sup> om. V 800 sed] secundum V praedicative NO 801 respondi V 802 quasi] ad add. O 803 dicitur] cum dicitur om. O 804 et om. O erunt V dicere] differentiae V 806 super] supra N entitatis] entis V 806-807 Illud...entitatis om. per hom. O 807 entitatis] entis V addet N 808 aliquem om. O 808-809 extremi...praedicatio om. per hom. O 809, 811 entitatis] entis V 810 entitas] entis V unum] totum W pura] praedicatur V 811 ratio rationalitatis] realitatis ideo V 811-812 ergo...impossibilis om. O 813 negando] considerando ? O 814 non om. N nihileitas] non entitas O: animalitas W 815 II] primo add. O negativam] -tionem V; praedicationem O 816 non<sup>2</sup> om. N 818 non om. O subiecti] sibi O 819 supponitur] sumitur V rationalitatis] -litas V

820 Alio modo posset forte dici quod ista 'rationalitas est entitas' potest concedi. Ad cuius evidentiam est sciendum primo quod licet adiectiva non possunt praedicari nisi formaliter, nam ex eo quod adiectiva sunt significant formam per modum informantis seu adiacentis, tamen substantiva possunt dupliciter praedicari, scilicet quandoque formaliter, quandoque per identitatem, et hoc nunc supponatur.

825 Secundo quod ubicumque utrumque vel alterum extremorum est formaliter infinitum potest esse praedicatio per identitatem etiam in abstracto sine praedicatione formali, sicut hic 'divina essentia est paternitas'.

Tertio quod licet conceptus entis non sit infinitus intensive, tamen in ordine conceptuum habet quamdam illimitationis infinitatem, propter quam potest poni  
830 identice idem cum quolibet sibi compossibili, maxime cum nulla ratio sit tam intima sicut est ratio entitatis cuicumque rationi sibi compossibili.

Quarto quod ista 'rationalitas est entitas' potest verificari identice, licet non formaliter, nam rationalitas est compossibilis entitati cum in eodem quiditative includantur.

835 Praeterea rationalitas vel est entitas vel non, nam non est dare medium cum hic sit vera contradictio. Si est entitas, habeo propositum; si non est entitas, cum non esse entitatem dicat puram negationem, et per consequens pure nihil, difficile videtur salvare quod rationalitas non sit nihil. Secus autem esset si ly 'formaliter' adderetur, ut prius visum est.

Critical Text', *Traditio* 39 (1983) 261.91-94; Peter of Spain, *Tractatus Called Afterwards Summule Logicales*, ed. L. M. de Rijk (Assen, 1972), p. 72.10-14; Walter Burleigh, *De puritate artis logicae tractatus longior*, ed. Philotheus Boehner (St. Bonaventure, N. Y., 1955), p. 213.7-11. 820-875 De praedicatione identica, vide etiam Petri Thomae *Quodlibet* q.6: 'Utrum identitas identica possit poni in aliquo sine infinitate intensiva utriusque vel alterius extremorum' (ed. Hooper-Buytaert, pp. 87-118). 820-824 Scotus, 1 *Ord.* d.5 n.23 (Vat. 4.21-22). 825-827 *ibid.* n.24 (Vat. 4.22); d.8 n.221 (Vat. 4.276). 828-830 Cf. *ibid.* d.8 n.141 (Vat. 4.224:2-8). 832-834 *ibid.* d.8 n.218 'Adnotatio Duns Scoti' (Vat. 4.274:22-23); *QQ Metaph.* 4.1 n.10 (Vivès 7.151a); *QQ De an.* q.21 n.12 (Vivès 3.618a-b).

820 forte *om. O* dici *ut vid. W* ista] scilicet *add. N* 821 primo *om. V* licet *om. O* adiectiva] secundum *add. O* 821-822 non...adiectiva *om. per hom. W* non...significant *om. O: in marg. V* 821 possint *N* 823 substantivam *V* 824 quandoque] quoniam *W* 824-826 et...identitatem *om. per hom. et potest (l. 826)...identitatem in marg. suppl. N* 824 et hoc *om. O* 825 vel] videtur *V* vel alterum *om. O* extremum *O* est *om. V* 826 praedicatio] -cato *V* etiam in] et non *O* 828 conceptus] -tum *O* in *om. V* 829 conceptuum] -tum *O* quam] quod *V* 830 identice] -tate *NV* idem] vel *VW* quolibet sibi] quocumque simpliciter *O* sit *om. V* 831 intima] intensiva *O* sicut est] sit *O* entitatis] entis *O* 832 quarta *O: secundo W* identice] -tate *NV* 834 includitur *O* 835 vel *om. V* non<sup>2</sup>] est entitas *add. O* 836 contradictio] conditio *W* habeo *om. W* 837 esse *om. V* entitatem] -tate *W* dicat] indicat *V* puram] privationem sive *add. O* pure] praedicatur ut *V* difficile] deficere *W* 838 salvari *O* ly *om. O* 839 est *om. O*

840 Ad formam, quando dicitur quod omnis praedicatio in abstracto est essentialis et quiditativa, falsum est, sed vel est quiditativa vel identica.

Contra: Scotus dicit quod in creaturis non est aliqua praedicatio vera per identitatem quae non sit formalis. Sed haec praedicatio 'rationalitas est entitas' est vera per identitatem secundum te. Ergo est formalis, quod est contra te.

845 Praeterea quando aliquod tertium est causa identitatis aliquorum, si quodlibet illorum ab illo tertio abstrahatur, non manet causa identitatis ipsorum. Haec est evidens. Sed species quae quidem includit quiditative entitatem et rationalitatem est causa identitatis utriusque. Ergo si a specie abstrahatur, non manebit causa aliqua identitatis. Sed cum dicitur rationalitas et entitas, sumuntur sic abstractivae. Ergo

850 non manet aliqua causa identitatis entitatis et rationalitatis.

Praeterea conceptus simpliciter simplices sunt primo diversi. Sed conceptus rationalitatis et entitatis sunt simpliciter simplices. Ergo nullo modo idem.

Confirmatur. Ista rationes sunt ultimate abstractae et neutra aliam includit per te. Ergo nullo modo sunt idem.

855 Ad primum: maior est intelligenda de praedicatione rationis limitatae de ratione limitata, non autem ubi est praedicatio rationis illimitatae de limitata. Nam illimitatio est causa identitatis identicae, non autem identitatis formalis. Entitas autem importat quandam rationem illimitatam, ut dictum est.

Ad secundum: maior est vera si illud tertium sit praecisa causa identitatis  
860 illorum. Sic autem non est in proposito, nam species non est praecisa causa identitatis rationalitatis et entitatis, sed potius illimitatio ex parte entitatis cum compossibilitate ex parte rationalitatis, quae quidem manent ipsis a specie abstractis.

Ad tertium: sicut ponitur duplex identitas, scilicet identica et formalis, ita potest  
865 poni correspondenter duplex primo diversitas. Quando ergo dicitur quod conceptus simpliciter simplices, de quibus constat quod sunt formales, sint primo diversi, verum est de illa prima diversitate quae opponitur identitati formali, quod patet etiam in rebus ipsis. Nam duae relationes oppositae in divinis sunt primo diversae formaliter, et tamen sunt identice identitate idem.

842-843 1 *Ord.* d.8 n.218 (Vat. 4.274:14-15); n.127 (Vat. 4.216:20-21). 844 'secundum te', sc. Petrum Thomae. 845-847 Scotus, 1 *Ord.* d.8 n.219 (Vat. 4.275:7-9). 858 supra, ll. 828-829.

843 est<sup>2</sup> *om.* *N* 844 secundum] per *O* 845 quolibet *VW* 846 illo tertio] ipso *V*  
non *om.* *O* causa] *hic desinit O* 847 rationalitatem] et *add. V*  
848-849 Ergo...identitatis *om. per hom. N* aliqua *om. W* 849 identitatis] utriusque *add.*  
*W* et] est *V* 850 entitatis *om. N* 852 idem *om. N* 853 et] quae *V*  
855 primam *codd.* rationis] rei *V* 855-856 de...limitata *om. V* 856 limitata<sup>1</sup>] -tae *W*  
ubi est praedicatio] de praedicatione *V* rationis] rei *V* limitata<sup>2</sup>] illimitata *V*: illimitato  
*N* 857 formaliter *N* 860-861 illorum...identitatis *om. per hom. W* 861 rationalitatis  
et entitatis] entitas et rationalitas *W*: identicae formalis entitatis et rationalitatis *N* sed] scilicet  
*W* illimitatio] illatio *V* 867 identitati] idem entitati *V* 869 identice *om. N*



870 Ad confirmationem: nego consequentiam, nam licet neutra ipsarum aliam quiditative includat, ut dictum est, tamen bene possunt esse identice idem.

Ad confirmationem rationis principalis: ista praedicatio 'entitas est ens' non est propria nec formalis, nam entitas est ratio formalis entis. Nihil autem formaliter praedicatur de sua formali ratione. Tunc enim haec esset vera 'humanitas est  
875 homo', 'animalitas est animal' et sic de aliis.

Ad tertium principale: quattuor possunt distingui modi praedicationis. Aliquid enim praedicatur secundum se, non tamen in quid nec per se, sicut hoc lignum est album. Aliquid praedicatur in quid et per se, ut homo est animal. Aliquid praedicatur per se et non in quid, ut homo est rationalis. Aliquid praedicatur non  
880 tamen per se, nec in quid nec secundum se, ut album est lignum. Ulterius est notandum quod licet praedicatum in praedicatione identica non praedicetur per se primo modo formaliter, tamen potest poni praedicari per se essentialiter, cum identitas identica non sit identitas accidentalis sed essentialis et realis.

Contra: Philosophus non ponit istum modum praedicandi per se in explicatione  
885 illius primi modi per se.

Respondeo: primo, quod 'locus ab auctoritate' non tenet negative. Secundo, quod Philosophus non curavit nisi de illis modis per se qui demonstrationem ingrediuntur. Concedo ergo quod ens uno modo praedicatur tam de suis passionibus quam de differentiis per se primo modo praeposito, et secundum aliam  
890 considerationem praedicatur de eis nec per se nec secundum se, sed quasi per accidens, ut dicit Doctor, scilicet ut denominabile de denominativo et determinabile de determinativo.

Ad formam: patet ex distinctione praemissa quod ista praedicatio 'rationalitas est ens' et potest esse secundum se secundum unam considerationem, et non  
895 secundum se secundum aliam.

Ad quartum strice respondeo: nego minorem.

Ad probationem, quando dicitur concipiens quodcumque obiectum ex ipso potest concipere ens, verum est si illud obiectum contineat ens vel virtualiter vel essentialiter, et sic habes illud quod prius. Aliter potest dici quod licet differentia  
900 non contineat nec virtualiter nec essentialiter, id est quiditative, ipsum ens, tamen quiditative includitur in aliquo ens quiditative includente, et ideo concipiens differentiam quasi per accidens potest ipsum ens concipere.

872 supra, II. 18-20.

876 supra, II. 21-29.

884-885 *APo* 1.4 (73a34-b25).

887-888 *ibid.* (73a21-25).

891 1 *Ord.* d.3 nn.134, 147 (Vat. 3.83:16-18; 91:9-10).

896 supra, II. 30-36.

873 nam] nec <i>W</i>	881 licet] <i>li V</i>	882 potest <i>om. V</i>	883 identitas <sup>1</sup> ] vel <i>add. VW</i>
887 per se <i>om. V</i>	891 Doctor] auctor <i>V</i>	scilicet] sicut <i>V</i>	893 distinctione]
definitione <i>VW</i>	praedicatio] propositio <i>V</i>	895 aliam] et <i>add. V</i>	896 respondendo <i>W</i>
897 quando] cum <i>V</i>	899 et sic] sicut <i>V</i>	illud] idem <i>N: id W</i>	900 id est <i>om. V</i>

Ad quintum dico quod ultima differentia non includit quiditative aliquam perfectionem ab ipsa extrahibilem, alias haberet conceptum resolubilem. Et cum  
905 dicitur 'rationalitas includit unitatem etc.' petitur quod deberet probari.

Ad sextum dico quod ens non inest quiditative speciei ratione differentiae, sed solum ratione generis, et per consequens non magis inest quiditative speciei ratione differentiae quam ratione generis, ut assumit illa minor.

Ad septimum: quod forma sit magis ens secundum ultimum gradum dupliciter  
910 potest intelligi: uno modo quod sit magis ens quiditative, et sic propositio illa veritatem non habet; alio modo ut dicatur magis ens, id est perfectius et completius ens, et sic concedo propositionem. Sed ex hoc non sequitur nisi quod ultima differentia perfectiori modo sit ens.

Contra: quod perfectiori modo est ens perfectiori modo recipit praedicationem  
915 entis. Sed differentia perfectiori modo est ens quam genus per te. Genus autem recipit praedicationem entis in eo quod quid. Ergo multo fortius differentia recipiet praedicationem entis in eo quod quid.

Respondeo: concedo quod differentia perfectiori modo est ens quam genus, differentia enim est ens modo actus et formae, genus materiae et potentiae. Sed ex  
920 hoc non sequitur quod recipiat praedicationem entis in eo quod quid, tum quia praedicari in eo quod quid non videtur dicere perfectionem, cum conveniat conceptibus valde imperfectis, cuiusmodi sunt conceptus primorum generum, quanto enim conceptus communior tanto confusior, et per consequens imperfectior; tum quia differentia perfectiori modo est ens quam sit genus, ut dictum est,  
925 et tamen genus praedicatur in quid et non differentia; tum quia, ut etiam potest inferri ex dictis, recipere praedicationem entis in eo quod quid non est recipere perfectiori modo, nam genus est ens modo infimo quia materiae, et tamen recipit praedicationem entis in eo quod quid. Potest autem dici quod differentia recipit praedicationem entis perfectius aliquo modo quam genus, quia differentia recipit  
930 ut determinans actuans et perficiens, genus vero ut determinabile potentiale et perfectibile.

Ad octavum: licet ens non includatur quiditative in conceptu differentiae, tamen non accidit simpliciter ipsi differentiae, immo aliqualiter per se primo modo, ut

903 supra, ll. 37-44.      906 supra, ll. 45-52.      909 supra, ll. 53-57.      932 supra, ll. 58-61.      933-934 supra, ll. 876-883.

905 petit V      debet V      911 veritatem] unitatem N      dicitur V      913 perfectiori]  
-fectorum W      sit] est N      ens] quam genus add. N      914 perfectiori'] -tionem W  
praedicationem] primam add. V      915 quam] quasi W      916-917 Ergo...quid om. per hom.  
W      recipit V      917 entis om. V      918 post genus transp. concedo V      919 enim om.  
actus] alicuius W      formae] et add. W      genus] modo add. N      920 recipiant W  
921 praedicari] -catio V; -catur N      922 sunt om. V      primorum] praedicatorum N  
925 genus om. V      ut om. OVW      927 materiae] manere W      928-929 in...entis om. per  
hom. N      930 genus] substantia N; ergo W      932 includitur W

dictum fuit supra. Differentia etiam quiditative includitur in aliquo ens quiditative  
935 includente, et hoc sufficit ad hoc quod ipsa sit per se intelligibilis.

Ad nonum: detur tota deductio. Sed si inferas plus, 'participat de entitate, ergo  
ens praedicatur de ea in eo quod quid', nego consequentiam propter iam dicta.

Contra: illud quod aliquid in suo conceptu quiditative includit, verius et  
perfectius participat ipsum quam illud quod ipsum idem quiditative non includit.  
940 Sed genus includit quiditative ens et differentia non per te. Ergo genus verius  
participat et perfectius ens quam differentia.

Confirmatur: quanto participatum est intimius participant, tanto participatio est  
perfectior et essentialior. Sed participatum inclusum in conceptu quiditative  
participantis magis est intimum quam si non esset inclusum. Ergo participatio per  
945 inclusionem quiditativam est perfectior et essentialior.

Ideo videtur minor principalis rationis neganda, illa scilicet quae dicit quod  
differentia plus participat de actualitate quam genus, cuius ratio est, quia formalis  
conceptus differentiae proprie loquendo non potest esse participans, nam omnis  
conceptus proprie participans est includens, et per consequens non simpliciter  
950 simplex. Sed proprius conceptus differentiae est simpliciter simplex. Ergo non  
potest poni proprie participans. Maior est evidens ex ratione nominis, cum enim  
participare sit 'partem capere', oportet quod participatum habeat rationem partis,  
et per consequens rationem inclusi.

Contra: omne quod est ens aut est totum ens aut pars entis. Sed differentia  
955 aliquo modo est ens et non totum ens. Patet ergo quod est pars entis, et per  
consequens participat ens.

Respondeo: nego maiorem. Aliquid enim est quod nec est totum ens nec pars  
entis proprie loquendo, sicut patet in proposito nostro. Nam conceptus differentiae  
nec est totum ens nec est pars subiectiva entis, cum ipsum quiditative non includat,  
960 ut prius ostensum est. Est tamen vere ens tam praedicatione determinabili de  
determinativo quam praedicatione identica.

Ad decimum: concedo quod differentia ultima est per se ens non per aliquid  
additum medians inter ipsam et ens. Et quando infertur 'ergo est ens per se in quid  
vel formaliter', nego consequentiam. Non est enim idem aliquid praedicari de  
965 aliquo sine medio et praedicari per se in quid.

936 supra, ll. 62-65.

946 supra, ll. 63-64.

962 supra, ll. 66-68.

934 aliquo] ente *add. V*    936 entitate] ente *V*    937 ens *om. V*    propter iam dicta]  
proprium dictam *V*    938 verius] verum *W*    942 participant] -pationi *NW*    945 quidita-  
tivam] -tiva *W*    949 participans est *om. NW*    954-955 Sed...entis *om. per hom. N*  
955 quod *om. W*    957 ens *om. V*    959 est<sup>1</sup>] per *N*    ens *om. V*    includet *W*  
960 determinabili] -bilis *W*    961 determinativo] -nato *V*    962 per aliquid] aliquod *V*  
963 ipsum *V*    965 quid] formaliter *add. W*

Ad confirmationem: antecedens illud est ad oppositum, nam si differentia ultima est simpliciter simplex, ut dicit, ergo impossibile est quod quiditative includat ens, cuius oppositum conatur concludere.

Ad undecimum: nego illud assumptum, scilicet quod substantia per se praedicetur de ultima differentia. Nam genus non praedicatur in quid nec per se de differentia, ut expresse dicit Philosophus.

Ad probationem, cum dicitur quod est pars essentialis substantiae est per se substantia, verum est de partibus quarum quaelibet est aliqua natura et aliqua essentia. Sed differentia, licet sumatur ab aliqua realitate in natura reperta, tamen

Contra: ex non substantiis non fit substantia. Ergo ex non substantiis formaliter non fit substantia formaliter. Ergo ex non entibus formaliter non fit ens formaliter. Sed species est ens formaliter. Constituitur autem ex genere et differentia. Ergo tam genus quam differentia est ens formaliter.

Praeterea impossibile est quod aliquid sit formalis ratio essendi et non sit ens formaliter. Sed differentia est speciei formalis ratio essendi. Ergo est formaliter ens.

Ad primum: praemitto quod formaliter loquendo nec materia nec forma est quiditative substantia, nam nullum genus praedicatur in quid nisi de suis partibus subiectivis. Sed materia et forma non sunt partes subiectivae substantiae. Ergo substantia non praedicatur de eis in quid. Maior patet, tum ex descriptione generis, genus enim est quod praedicatur de pluribus differentibus specie in eo quod quid; tum quia superius in linea praedicamentali non praedicatur nisi de subordinatis directe in eadem linea; solae autem partes subiectivae subordinantur in linea praedicamentali directe. Minor patet, tum quia materia et forma sunt partes

essentiales, tum quia non sunt in genere nisi per reductionem ex communi dicto, nec in linea praedicamentali directe subordinantur.

Praeterea impossibile est totum de sua parte essentiali praedicari praedicatione formali. Sed materia et forma sunt partes substantiae quae ponitur genus generalissimum. Ergo impossibile est substantiam de materia et forma formali praedicatione praedicari. Maior est evidens, alias pars esset formaliter ipsum totum. Minor patet per Boethium in *Commento super librum Praedicamentorum*.

966 supra, ll. 69-70. 969 supra, ll. 71-75. 970-971 *Metaph.* 3.3 t.10 (998b21-28).  
 985-986 *Ista descriptio generis accipitur ex Porphyrio, Isagoge De genere (ArL 1/6-7.6:24-7:1).*  
 996 *In Categorias Aristotelis* 1 De substantia (PL 64.184b).

970 Nam non *W* 973 est *om. W* 975 essentia] esse *W* 977 formaliter<sup>1</sup> *om. W*  
 978 et] ex *add. N* 980 formaliter *N* 985 substantia *om. V* tum] tunc *V*  
 986 praedicatur] in quid *add. V* 988 subordinantur] -nans *V* 990 dicto] divisione *N*  
 993 forma ut vid. *N* 995 pars *om. V* 996-998 per...patet *om. per hom. V*

Confirmatur: nulla pars integralis vel essentialis includit quiditative suum totum. Ergo nec materia nec forma includit quiditative substantiam. Antecedens patet, nam ponere totum essenziale vel integrale includi in sua parte est ponere totum non  
1000 esse totum et partem non esse partem, cum de ratione totius, saltem essentialis vel integralis, sit includere et de ratione partis includi.

Ex praedictis concludo corollarie primo, quod non est inconveniens aliquid non esse substantiam quiditative, et tamen esse substantiam principative et constitutive; secundo, quod non est inconveniens aliquid esse ens principative et constitutive,  
1005 et tamen non esse ens formaliter et quiditative. Patet ex praecedenti.

Praeterea communis schola concedit quod aliquid non quid praedicatione est quid constitutive, ut de differentia specifica. Patet ergo quod non est mirum ponere aliquid esse quid constitutive et non esse quid subiective.

Ad formam, nego consequentiam primam, quia plus accipitur in consequente  
1010 quam in antecedente; similiter secundam quae ex prima inferitur.

Ad secundum faciendo vim in verbis, dicendum quod differentia non est formalis ratio sic essendi vel talis entis. Cum autem dicitur 'tale ens' duo importantur, scilicet conceptus entis et conceptus talitatis. Differentia ergo non est formalis ratio alicui quod sit ens, sed quod sit tale ens, puta homo vel leo. Et ideo praecise  
1015 loquendo differentia est formalis ratio talitatis vel talis entitatis.

Ad duodecimum: nulla differentia enti addita facit nugationem, quia nulla ens quiditative includit. Sustinendo etiam opinionem vulgi argumentum non concludit, nam non est simile de corporeitate et rationalitate, supposito quod rationalitas sumatur ab ultima realitate, nam diceretur quod corporeitas quiditative includit ens,  
1020 non autem rationalitas.

Ad tertium decimum respondet Scotus quod non oportet dicere argumenta III *Metaphysicae* concludere, quia Philosophus intendit ibi arguere ad oppositas partes quaestionum quas disputat, sicut ipsemet promittit in prooemio. Duo autem opposita concludi non possunt nisi alterum argumentum sit sophisticum.

1009-1010 supra, II. 976-977. 1011 supra, II. 980-981. 1016 supra, II. 76-79.  
1017 De opinione vulgi, cf. supra, II. 470-475, 521-537. 1021 supra, II. 80-87. 1021-36 I  
Ord. d.3 n.158 (Vat. 3.95-96). 1023 *Metaph.* 3.1 t.1 (995a24-b4).

999 includi] -ditur V 1000 de om. V ratione] ipsius add. W 1001 partis] sit add.  
V 1002 aliquid] ad W 1003 substantiam?] subiectum N 1005 esse] est V et<sup>2</sup> om.  
W quiditative] constitutive V praecedentibus N 1006 concedit] concludit N  
praedicatione] sed add. N 1007-1008 ut...constitutive om. per hom. V 1008 quid<sup>2</sup> om. N  
1010 antecedente] et add. W secundam] -da NW quae] quod V: om. N  
1011 secundum] duodecimam N vim] videtur fort. V 1012 essendi om. NV  
1012-14 cum...ens<sup>1</sup> om. W 1012 autem om. V tale ens] talia V importantur]  
-ponuntur N 1013 entis] etiam add. V talitatis] rationalitatis V 1015 talitatis] qualitatis  
NV talis om. NV entitatis] entalitatis W 1016 nugationem] negationem W nullum  
W 1017 includit] et add. V concludit] includit V 1019 dicitur W 1021 tertium  
decimum] quartum W 1022 ad om. V 1024 argumentum om. N sophisticum]  
foristicum? V

- 1025 Confirmatur per Commentatorem ibidem commento primo in principio sic dicentem intendit in hoc tractatu inducere sermones disputativos qui affirmant et destruunt idem in omnibus quaestionibus difficilibus huius scientiae. Quod autem argumentum Philosophi quod fit in proposito non concludat, probat Scotus sic: Philosophus ponit quaestionem sub his verbis: 'quare si unum genus aut ens, nulla  
1030 differentia nec una nec <ens> erit'. Aut ergo intendit inferre quod differentia non erit ens et unum per se primo modo, et sic conclusio non est inconueniens de uno, cum unum de nullo praedicatur per se primo modo; aut intendit inferre negativam absolute, scilicet quod differentia non est ens et unum, et tunc consequentia non valet. Non enim sequitur, si rationale est differentia animalis, quod rationale non  
1035 est animal, sed quod non est per se primo modo animal. Peccat igitur processus Philosophi, et per consequens non debet pro auctoritate allegari.

- Tamen quia, licet hoc sit multum rationabiliter dictum, videtur quoddam diffugium, ideo dixerunt aliqui quod ratio Philosophi procedit particulariter, scilicet de differentiis mediis tantum, de quibus ens praedicatur per se primo modo.  
1040 Sed hoc non videtur nisi diffugium, et ideo tenendo quod ratio procedat de omnibus differentiis, potest dici quod teneat sic: impossibile est genus de differentia identice praedicari; sed ens praedicatur identice de differentiis, et similiter unum; ergo impossibile est ens aut unum esse genus. Ex praedictis patet ad formam argumenti. Et ex dictis hic suppleri potest responsio ad primum repugnationis  
1045 Aureoli.

Quia vero in multiloquio, maxime circa materiam difficillimam, peccatum non deerit, omnia supra scripta ut dicta scholastice habeantur et sine praeiudicio sententiae cuiuscumque.

1025 *In Metaph.* 3 t.1 (Iunt. 8.361). 1028 1 *Ord.* d.3 n.158 (Vat. 3.96). 1029-30 *Metaph.* 3.3 t.10 (998b26-27). 1038-39 Hic verba Alnwick Petrus Thomae tantum iteravit: 'Nec valet dicere quod ratio Philosophi est particularis, quia ens praedicatur per se de differentiis mediis...' (ed. Dumont, p. 51.470-472). Alnwick autem opinionem ipsius Scoti allegat. 1044-45 supra, II. 545-551.

1026 disputativos] -tationis *V* 1027 difficilior *N* 1030 nec<sup>2</sup> *om. N* 1031 erit] est  
*V* 1032 aut] ut *V* negative *V* 1034 est differentia *om. N* 1035 est animal *om. V*  
1036 auctoritate] antecedente *N* 1037 hoc sit multum *om. V* rationaliter *V*  
1039 quibus] aliquibus *V* 1040 ratio *om. V*: non *add. et del. W* 1044 Et...potest] hic  
potest supplere *V* 1046 multiloquio *V*

## SIGER OF BRABANT AND THEOLOGY

Armand Maurer, C.S.B.

WHILE William Dunphy and I were preparing the editions of the Vienna and Cambridge manuscripts of Siger of Brabant's *Quaestiones in Metaphysicam*, we found that both contain a passage in which he describes six ways in which sacred theology (which he calls 'the science that is sacred Scripture') differs from theology in the Aristotelian sense (which he calls 'the theology that is part of philosophy'). The Vienna manuscript has the fuller account of the subject; the Cambridge manuscript has a shortened version of it. The passage is not in the Paris or Munich manuscripts of Siger's *Quaestiones*. This is not surprising because the former is highly abridged and the latter ends before book 6, in which the passage is found.<sup>1</sup>

Since this is the only treatment of sacred theology in Siger's known works, we drew attention to its importance in a brief note.<sup>2</sup> We also suggested that the source of Siger's description of sacred theology is Thomas Aquinas' *Summa theologiae* 1.1. We made no attempt to compare in detail Siger's account of theology with that of Aquinas; neither did we relate it to Siger's broader views of faith and reason. The present article aims to accomplish these objectives.

Siger's comparison of the two kinds of theology — rather unexpected in a commentary on Aristotle's *Metaphysics* — seems to have been suggested to him by a remark at the end of the first article of Aquinas' *Summa*: 'Hence the theology pertaining to sacred doctrine differs in kind from the theology that is a part of philosophy'.<sup>3</sup> Taking his cue from this statement, Siger describes six ways in which

<sup>1</sup> Dunphy edited ms. Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek 2330 (= V), with a revised edition of Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 9559: *Siger de Brabant. Quaestiones in Metaphysicam* (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1981). Maurer edited ms. Cambridge, Peterhouse 152 (= C), with a revised edition of Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 16297 (= P): *Siger de Brabant. Quaestiones in Metaphysicam* (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1983). The passage in question is found in ed. Dunphy, 6, com. 1, pp. 359-61, and in ed. Maurer, 6, com., pp. 303.70-304.9. In general, quotations will be given from V since it has the fuller account of the subject; C will be quoted when it has a significant addition.

<sup>2</sup> W. Dunphy and A. Maurer, 'A Promising New Discovery for Sigerian Studies', *Mediaeval Studies* 29 (1967) 364-69.

<sup>3</sup> 'Unde theologia quae ad sacram doctrinam pertinet differt secundum genus ab illa theologia quae pars philosophiae ponitur' (*ST* 1.1.1 ad 2). Siger uses Thomas' phrase 'theologia quae [est] pars philosophiae' to denote philosophical theology or metaphysics. See *QQ Metaph.*, ed. Dunphy, pp. 359-61.

the two kinds of theology differ. Moreover, in making the comparison he follows the order of the articles in the first question of the *Summa*, with only a slight variation in V.<sup>4</sup>

Before we examine Siger's description of the two theologies against the background of the *Summa*, a clarification of language is in order. In the *Summa*, Thomas prefers the term 'sacred doctrine' (*sacra doctrina*) to denote the teaching of 'the matters that pertain to the Christian religion'.<sup>5</sup> Occasionally he uses the term 'theology' (*theologia*) and 'sacred Scripture' (*sacra scriptura*), but, as Congar says, these terms are on the whole equivalent for Thomas Aquinas. 'In fact', Congar writes, 'St. Thomas does not hesitate to use one for the other in the course of an argument.'<sup>6</sup> Gilby, translator and commentator on the *Summa* 1.1, makes the same point: 'In the first question of the *Summa* the terms holy teaching, *sacra doctrina*, and holy Scripture, *sacra scriptura*, are synonymous: this was common usage at a time when a master of theology or doctor of divinity was still called a *magister in sacra pagina*. Among Thomas' contemporaries Robert Kilwardby equated theology and Scripture, and St. Albert spoke indiscriminately of holy Scripture, theology and theological science, all three standing for the teaching we receive from God.'<sup>7</sup> In the prologue to 1.1.10, Aquinas speaks of 'the sacred writings of this doctrine' (*scriptura sacra huius doctrinae*), indicating that sacred doctrine comprises more than the sacred Scriptures. As Congar says, it also includes theology in its scientific form, catechesis and Christian preaching.<sup>8</sup> But

<sup>4</sup> The fourth way in C is placed fifth in V. The order in C exactly corresponds to that of the articles in the *ST* 1.1. I shall, however, follow the order in V since my citations are mainly from it. Aquinas' *Summa* is cited from the Leonine edition, vol. 4 (Rome, 1888).

<sup>5</sup> See *ST*, prol. For Aquinas' notion of *sacra doctrina* see G. F. Van Ackeren, *Sacra Doctrina. The Subject of the First Question of the Summa Theologica of Saint Thomas Aquinas* (Rome, 1952); É. Gilson, *Elements of Christian Philosophy* (Garden City, N. Y., 1960), pp. 22-42; M.-D. Chenu, *La théologie comme science au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, 3rd edition (Paris, 1957); J. A. Weisheipl, 'The Meaning of *Sacra Doctrina* in *Summa Theologiae* 1, q. 1', *The Thomist* 38 (1974) 49-80.

Chenu writes: '*Sacra doctrina*, c'est l'enseignement procédant de la révélation: avec toutes les ressources qui en découlent, avec tous les traitements qu'elle peut comporter dans l'esprit humain, de la lecture de la Bible à la déduction théologique. Donc diversité relative d'objets, de fonctions, de méthodes. De tout ce que nous avons dit il ressort que saint Thomas a distingué Écriture et théologie, foi et théologie ...'; to which he adds: 'On ne peut cependant pas, dans la série des dix articles de la Somme, répartir matériellement le sens général de *doctrina sacra* sur l'art. 1 (révélation), le sens technique sur les art. 2-8 (science), le sens scripturaire sur les art. 9-10' (p. 79 and n. 2).

<sup>6</sup> Y. M.-J. Congar, *A History of Theology*, trans. H. Guthrie (Garden City, N. Y., 1968), p. 92. The book substantially reproduces Congar's article 'Théologie' in the *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* 15 (Paris, 1938-39). See, for example, *ST* 1.1.3.

<sup>7</sup> St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* 1, ed. and trans. T. Gilby (New York-London, 1964), Appendix 11, p. 133. See Appendix 2, p. 48. Chenu writes: '... saint Thomas, tout comme ses contemporains, s'en tient, pour l'ensemble de son vocabulaire, à l'expression indéterminée *doctrina sacra*, qui couvre ainsi deux habitus distincts, et à l'équivalence des dénominations *scriptura sacra*, *doctrina sacra*, *theologia*' (*La théologie comme science*, p. 66).

<sup>8</sup> Congar, *A History of Theology*, pp. 92-93.



divine revelation, as contained in the Scriptures, is the root and principle of all these, so *sacra doctrina* can be said to be fundamentally *sacra scriptura*.

We should not be surprised, then, to find Siger following the theological usage of his time and speaking of sacred theology as *sacra scriptura*. He puts the question: 'What is the difference between the science of theology which is our present concern and which is a part of philosophy, and the science of theology which is not a part of philosophy but which is sacred Scripture?'<sup>9</sup> He does not use Aquinas' preferred term in the *Summa*, 'sacred doctrine', but, as we shall see, his description of sacred Scripture follows closely that of Aquinas' sacred doctrine.

We shall first examine the six ways in which Siger distinguishes between the two kinds of theology. We shall then comment on his notion of sacred theology in connection with his more general views on the relation between faith and reason.

## I

The first way philosophical theology differs from the science that is sacred Scripture, according to Siger, concerns their modes of procedure. Philosophical theology proceeds from principles known by the light of natural reason, using the senses, memory and experience. Sacred Scripture as a science begins from principles known through divine revelation; then from these principles it proceeds by way of human inquiry to apply them to other matters which are like conclusions of the science.<sup>10</sup>

Siger takes this comparison between the two theologies from Thomas' *Summa* 1.1.2, where the question is raised 'Whether sacred doctrine is a science?' Thomas distinguishes between the kind of science that proceeds from principles known by the natural light of the mind, like arithmetic and geometry, and sacred doctrine which takes its principles from the light of a higher science, namely, that of God and the blessed. Sacred doctrine holds on faith the principles revealed by God, somewhat as the science of optics proceeds from principles known through

<sup>9</sup> 'Consequenter quaeritur qualiter differat scientia theologia quam prae manibus habemus, quae est pars philosophiae, et scientia theologia quae non est pars philosophiae sed est sacra scriptura, nam utraque dicitur theologia' (*QQ Metaph.*, ed. Dunphy, p. 359.4-7).

<sup>10</sup> 'Dico ergo quod differunt quantum ad modum considerandi, quia modus considerandi in ista theologia, quae est pars philosophiae, est procedere ex principiis quae sunt nota nobis via sensus, memoriae et experimenti, ex lumine et ratione naturali. Modus autem considerandi in theologia quae est sacra scriptura non est procedere ex principiis quae sint nota via sensus, memoriae et experimenti et lumine naturali, sed proceditur in ea ex principiis notis per divinam revelationem, sicut multis sanctis nota fuerunt per revelationem divinam. Deinde autem ex illis principiis, sic notis per revelationem divinam, proceditur per investigationem humanam, applicando ad alia, sicut ad conclusiones illius scientiae, illa principia' (*QQ Metaph.*, ed. Dunphy, pp. 359.16-360.26). For the origin of science in sensation, memory and experience, see Aristotle, *Metaph.* 1.1 (980a27-b2).

geometry, and music from principles known through arithmetic.<sup>11</sup> In his commentary on the *De trinitate* of Boethius Thomas calls sciences that take their principles on faith from a higher science 'subalternated sciences'. This type of science was known to Aristotle; by analogy Thomas extended it to the science of sacred doctrine.<sup>12</sup>

Siger does not use the term 'subalternated science' in his description of sacred Scripture, but he clearly intends that, in its own way, it verifies the notion of a science, having both principles and conclusions drawn from them through human reasoning and investigation. The principles are known through divine revelation; human inquiry then applies them to other matters which are like conclusions of the science:

Deinde autem ex illis principiis, sic notis per revelationem divinam, proceditur per investigationem humanam, applicando ad alia, sicut ad conclusiones illius scientiae, illa principia.<sup>13</sup>

This is an echo of Thomas' *Summa* 1.1.8 ad 2, where he shows that sacred doctrine uses human reason, not in order to prove its principles, which are the articles of faith, but to draw from them the consequences they imply:

... principia huius doctrinae per revelationem habentur ... Utitur tamen sacra doctrina etiam ratione humana, non quidem ad probandum fidem ... sed ad manifestandum aliqua alia quae traduntur in hac doctrina.

Siger's second difference between sacred Scripture and the theology that is part of philosophy concerns their objects. Philosophical theology is limited to whatever human reason can know through creatures, whereas the science that is sacred Scripture extends to what is above human reason and cannot be known through creatures alone. Its object includes everything that can only be known through divine revelation, either because it has been revealed or because it is known 'in the manner of divine revelation' (*per modum divinae revelationis*). Thus everything whatsoever comes within the ambit of this kind of theology: not only God but all natural things and even mathematics.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>11</sup> ST 1.1.2c.

<sup>12</sup> *Expositio super librum Boethii De trinitate* 2.2 ad 5, ed. B. Decker (Leiden, 1955), p. 89.5-14. See Aristotle, *Post. Anal.* 1.13 (78b35-39). For St. Thomas' notion of theology as a science, see Chenu, *La théologie comme science*, pp. 67-92.

<sup>13</sup> *QQ Metaph.*, p. 360.23-26.

<sup>14</sup> 'Differunt etiam quantum ad considerata in eis, quia haec scientia theologia quae est pars philosophiae non extendit considerationem suam nisi usque ad ea quae per rationem humanam et per creaturas tantum possunt cognosci a nobis. Illa autem scientia theologia quae est sacra scriptura extendit considerationem suam ad ea quae sunt supra rationem humanam et quae per creaturas tantum non possunt cognosci: nam, sicut dictum est, ipsa considerat ea quae per revelationem divinam tantum possunt cognosci. Unde et quaecumque scibilia sunt per modum divinae revelationis, sive sint entia naturalia, sive divina, sive mathematica, sive quaecumque, in eo quod cadunt vel cadere

Siger is here drawing upon Thomas' *Summa* 1.1.3: 'Whether sacred doctrine is one science?' Thomas shows that sacred doctrine (here called *sacra scriptura*) is one science because, despite the material diversity of the things it embraces, they are all viewed from the same formal perspective of divine revelation. Whatever has been divinely revealed, or is even divinely revealable, shares in the same formality of the object of this science and is included in the one sacred doctrine. Similarly, the sense of sight extends to a wide diversity of things, but because they are all alike in being colored — which is the formal object of sight — they come under the one sense of sight.<sup>15</sup>

Siger takes from this article of Thomas the notion that sacred theology considers all things ('sive sint entia naturalia, sive divina, sive mathematica, sive quaecumque') as long as they are known, or can be known, under the formality of divine revelation and with the mode proper to it.

Thirdly, according to Siger, sacred Scripture differs from philosophical theology because the former is a more universal science. Treating of everything that can come under the perspective of divine revelation, it can include both the principles and conclusions of the particular sciences insofar as they come under the formality of revelation. Philosophical theology, on the contrary, does not involve itself with the conclusions of the particular sciences.<sup>16</sup>

The source for this comparison of the two theologies is Thomas' reply to the second argument in article 3. There Thomas defends the unity of sacred doctrine on the ground of the universality of its formal object, which is divine revelation. An objector contends that sacred doctrine cannot be one science for it treats of

possunt sub modo sciendi vel cognoscendi ea per revelationem divinam, considerat haec scientia theologia quae est sacra scriptura, quae non est pars philosophiae' (*QQ Metaph.*, ed. Dunphy, p. 360.27-39).

<sup>15</sup> 'Dicendum sacram doctrinam unam scientiam esse. Est enim unitas potentiae et habitus considerata secundum obiectum, non quidem materialiter, sed secundum rationem formalem obiecti: puta homo, asinus et lapis conveniunt in una formali ratione colorati, quod est obiectum visus. Quia igitur sacra scriptura considerat aliqua secundum quod sunt divinitus revelata, secundum quod dictum est, omnia quaecumque sunt divinitus revelabilia, communicant in una ratione formali obiecti huius scientiae' (*ST* 1.1.3c; see *ibid.* ad 2).

For the notion of 'the revealable', see É. Gilson, *Elements*, pp. 34-35 and *Le thomisme*, 6th edition (Paris, 1965), pp. 20-23; and Chenu, *La théologie comme science*, p. 83 n. 3: 'Revelable, c'est tout ce qui est susceptible d'être connu à la lumière de la révélation; ce qu'exprime saint Thomas à l'art. 4: "prout sunt divino lumine cognoscibilia".'

<sup>16</sup> 'Differunt etiam tertio, quia theologia quae est sacra scriptura est magis universalis, quod patet ex praedictis. Nam si ipsa considerat omnia illa quaecumque possunt cadere sub ratione divinae revelationis, tunc haec non tantum possunt esse principia scientiarum particularium, sed etiam conclusiones particularium scientiarum. Sed scientia haec theologia quae est pars philosophiae non intromittit se de conclusionibus aliarum scientiarum particularium' (*QQ Metaph.*, ed. Dunphy, p. 360.40-46). C expresses the same idea, but in terms of the 'descent' to the principles and conclusions of the particular sciences. See ed. Maurer, p. 304.85-91.

different subject matters, such as angels, bodily creatures and human morality, each of which is the topic of a different philosophical science. Therefore sacred doctrine is not one science.

Thomas' reply is one of the most profound and astute in the first question of the *Summa*. He points out that nothing prevents the various subject matters that diversify the lower faculties and habits of the soul from being treated in common by a higher faculty or habit, because the higher faculty or habit has an object with a wider formal perspective. For example, each of the five senses has its own distinctive object: sight regards what is visible, sound what is audible. The higher *sensus communis*, however, has for its object what is sensible, which includes whatever is visible or audible. Thus the *sensus communis*, though one faculty of the soul, extends to all the objects of the five senses. Similarly, the subject matters of the different philosophical sciences can be treated by sacred doctrine under one formality, namely, insofar as they are possible objects of divine revelation ('inquantum scilicet sunt divinitus revelabilia'). Thus sacred doctrine is as it were the imprint in our mind of God's own knowledge, which is the single and simple knowledge of all things: 'sacra doctrina sit velut quaedam impressio divinae scientiae, quae est una et simplex omnium'.<sup>17</sup>

Commenting on this passage of Thomas Aquinas, Gilson remarks that 'it entails consequences so far-reaching that few among the disciples of Thomas Aquinas dare to follow them up to their ultimate implications.'<sup>18</sup> It is to Siger's credit that he saw its importance and took from it, not all its details to be sure, but its essential message. Because sacred Scripture has a more universal formal perspective than the particular philosophical sciences, namely, whatever can come under the formality and mode of knowing of divine revelation, it can embrace not only the principles of those sciences but also their conclusions. This implies that sacred theology, for Siger as for Thomas, can embrace all the sciences and parts of philosophy. They may not be divinely revealed, but they come under theology as divinely revealable. In contrast to the universality of sacred Scripture, Siger remarks, philosophical theology does not concern itself with the conclusions of the sciences and philosophy, with the implication that it does concern itself with their principles. This is

<sup>17</sup> 'Ad secundum dicendum quod nihil prohibet inferiores potentias vel habitus diversificari circa illas materias, quae communiter cadunt sub una potentia vel habitu superiori: quia superior potentia vel habitus respicit obiectum sub universaliori ratione formali. Sicut obiectum sensus communis est sensibile, quod comprehendit sub se visibile et audibile: unde sensus communis, cum sit una potentia, extendit se ad omnia obiecta quinque sensuum. Et similiter ea quae in diversis scientiis philosophicis tractantur, potest sacra doctrina, una existens, considerare sub una ratione, inquantum scilicet sunt divinitus revelabilia: ut sic sacra doctrina sit velut quaedam impressio divinae scientiae, quae est una et simplex omnium' (*ST* 1.1.3 ad 2).

<sup>18</sup> Gilson, *Elements*, p. 32.

good Thomistic doctrine, for according to Thomas metaphysics gives principles to the other sciences and proves those principles.<sup>19</sup>

Siger's fourth difference between the two theologies is that sacred Scripture has greater certitude than the theology that is part of philosophy. This is because the certitude of a science is a consequence of the certitude of its principles. Now, as has been said, the principles of philosophical theology come to us by way of the senses, memory and experience, which are not infallible avenues of knowledge. Sacred Scripture, on the other hand, proceeds from principles known through divine revelation, which cannot lead us into error. What is more, the principles of this science are better known and more certain than those of philosophical theology, with the result that its conclusions are also better known and more certain. We can say, then, that the whole science, including principles and conclusions, has the greater certitude.<sup>20</sup>

Siger's source here is Thomas' article 5: 'Whether sacred doctrine is nobler than the other sciences?' Thomas contends that sacred doctrine is nobler than the other sciences both as a theoretical and as a practical science. On its theoretical side it excels by its certitude and nobility of subject matter. The other sciences owe their certitude to the natural light of human reason, which can fall into error, while sacred doctrine has its certitude from the light of God's knowledge, which cannot err. As for the nobility of subject matter, sacred doctrine chiefly treats of realities that transcend reason, whereas the other sciences are only concerned with those within reason's grasp. Siger singles out the comparison of the two theologies based on their relative certitude, passing over in silence the other ways in which Thomas shows the greater nobility of sacred theology.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>19</sup> See *ST* 1.1.8c, 6 ad 2; *Super Boeth. De trin.* 5.1 ad 9 (ed. Decker, p. 172.13-19) and 6.1 ad tertiam quaest. (p. 212.20).

<sup>20</sup> 'Differunt quarto, quia theologia quae sacra scriptura est magis est certa quam ista theologia quae est pars philosophiae. Et hoc etiam apparet ex praedictis quia, sicut dictum est, theologia quae est pars philosophiae procedit ex principiis notis via sensus, memoriae et experimenti, et ita in cognitione suorum principiorum potest cadere error, ut sic cognoscuntur sicut in hac scientia cognoscuntur. Sed theologia sacra scriptura procedit ex principiis notis per divinam revelationem. In tali autem cognitione non potest cadere error. Et ideo, quia principia ex quibus procedit scientia theologia quae est sacra scriptura sunt magis nota et certa quam principia ex quibus procedit scientia theologia quae est pars philosophiae, et cuius principia sunt magis nota, eius conclusiones sunt magis notae et certiores, et per consequens tota scientia magis certa, hinc est quod theologia sacra scriptura est certior' (*QQ Metaph.*, ed. Dunphy, pp. 360.48-361.60).

<sup>21</sup> 'Speculativarum enim scientiarum una altera dignior dicitur, tum propter certitudinem, tum propter dignitatem materiae. Et quantum ad utrumque, haec scientia alias speculativas scientias excedit. Secundum certitudinem quidem, quia aliae scientiae certitudinem habent ex naturali lumine rationis humanae, quae potest errare: haec autem certitudinem habet ex lumine divinae scientiae, quae decipi non potest. Secundum dignitatem vero materiae, quia ista scientia est principaliter de his quae sua altitudine rationem transcendunt: aliae vero scientiae considerant ea tantum quae rationi subduntur' (*ST* 1.1.5c).

The fifth difference between the two theologies, according to Siger, is that sacred Scripture is both a theoretical and a practical science whereas philosophical theology is solely theoretical. He gives two reasons why sacred Scripture as a science is not only theoretical but also practical. First, it treats of everything that can be known through divine revelation, which includes not only theoretical matters (*speculabilia*) but also practical affairs, both things that can be made (*factibilia*) and things that can be done (*agibilia*). It is concerned with practical affairs insofar as they come under divine revelation or knowledge which is acquired by means of it. The second reason why sacred Scripture is both theoretical and practical is that revelation is a sort of imprint in us of God's own knowledge: 'revelatio non sit nisi impressio quaedam scientiae divinae'. Now God's knowledge is both theoretical and practical. It follows that the possible objects of revelation (*revelabilia*) are both theoretical and practical. Philosophical theology, on the contrary, is a purely theoretical science.<sup>22</sup>

Siger is here taking his cue from the *Summa* 1.1.4: 'Whether sacred doctrine is a practical science?', and also from article 3, reply to the second argument, where Thomas likens sacred doctrine to a kind of imprint of God's knowledge. The *Sed contra* of article 4 reminded Siger that *practica* includes both *factibilia* and *agibilia*.<sup>23</sup>

Siger finds a sixth difference between the two theologies in the fact that sacred Scripture has a greater claim to wisdom than philosophical theology. As Aristotle

<sup>22</sup> 'Differunt etiam quinto per hoc quod illa est practica, ista vero non. Et quod theologia quae est sacra scriptura sit practica et non tantum speculativa, apparet per duas rationes. Quarum prima est quia, sicut dictum est, illa considerat omnia illa quae cognosci possunt per revelationem divinam; haec autem possunt esse non solum speculabilia, verum etiam practica, id est factibilia vel agibilia. Ergo practibilia vel agibilia ipsa considerat inquantum ipsa possunt cadere sub revelatione divina, vel sub cognitione quae est per eam. Ergo ipsa aliquo modo est practica scientia. Hoc etiam patet alia ratione, nam si ipsa considerat ea quae imprimuntur in nobis per revelationem divinam, tunc ex ipsa impressione apparet quod est activa: ita quod, sicut theologia quae est pars philosophiae est scientia una speculativa, sic et theologia quae est sacra scriptura est scientia una practica seu activa, et non tantum speculativa, sicut ex praedictis patet. Haec autem theologia nullo modo est practica' (*QQ Metaph.*, ed. Dunphy, p. 361.61-74). In C this is given as the fourth difference between the two theologies (ed. Maurer, p. 304.92-97). The words 'revelatio non est nisi impressio quaedam divinae scientiae', adapted from Aquinas' 'sacra doctrina sit velut quaedam impressio divinae scientiae' (see above n. 17), are found only in C (ed. Maurer, p. 304.95-96).

Note that Siger uses 'revelatio' in place of 'sacra doctrina', as he also uses 'sacra scriptura' in place of 'sacra doctrina'. These terms are on the whole equivalent for Thomas (see Congar, *A History of Theology*, p. 92). If the results of the present study are correct, Siger does not reject the notion of 'sacra doctrina'; rather, he emphasizes the foundation of the science in the revelation contained in Scripture.

<sup>23</sup> 'Dicendum quod sacra doctrina ... una existens, se extendit ad ea quae pertinent ad diversas scientias philosophicas, propter rationem formalem quam in diversis attendit: scilicet prout sunt divino lumine cognoscibilia. Unde licet in scientiis philosophicis alia sit speculativa et alia practica, sacra tamen doctrina comprehendit sub se utramque; sicut et Deus eadem scientia se cognoscit, et ea quae facit' (*ST* 1.1.4c).

says, wisdom is a knowledge of the first causes and principles; for example, God and the separate substances. So the science with the better and more certain knowledge of these causes and principles has the greater claim to wisdom. This is the science that is sacred Scripture, because it knows them through divine revelation, which is a knowledge beyond the reach of pure human reason. Philosophical theology is limited to what can be known through human discovery and reasoning, using the mind's natural light. It follows that the former kind of theology is more a wisdom than the latter.<sup>24</sup>

This comparison has been taken from Thomas' article 6: 'Whether sacred doctrine is a wisdom?' While conceding that there are human wisdoms in every order of knowledge, Thomas contends that sacred doctrine is wisdom absolutely speaking, because it is knowledge of God, who is the supreme cause of the universe. Moreover, it treats of him not only as he can be known through creatures, as the philosophers knew him, but also as he is known to himself alone and has revealed himself to us.<sup>25</sup>

Siger concludes his comparison of the two theologies with a warning that the demonstrative method is not suited to sacred theology: 'It is clear from what has been said that they proceed in the worst way who want to use the demonstrative method in all matters in this science [that is, sacred Scripture]. For the principles of demonstration ought to be known through the senses, memory and experience; but, as has been said, the principles of this science are known through divine revelation.'<sup>26</sup>

<sup>24</sup> 'Differunt etiam sexto per hoc quod theologia quae est sacra scriptura magis est sapientia quam ista. Quod apparet sic. Nam dicit Aristoteles in principio *primi libri* huius scientiae [*Metaph.* 1.2 (982b9-10)], quod illa scientia dicitur sapientia quae considerat de primis causis et primis principiis, ut de Deo et aliis substantiis separatis. Tunc arguo: Illa scientia dicitur magis sapientia quae maiorem cognitionem et certiore habet de primis principiis entium. Sed sicut ex praedictis apparet, theologia quae sacra scriptura est, ipsa maiorem et certiore cognitionem habet de ipsis quam ista theologia, cum sint nota in ea per divinam revelationem, ad quam cognitionem non potest pertingere ratio humana per se, et ita nec ista theologia quae dicitur pars philosophiae, cum ipsa consideret solum illa quae per inventionem et rationem humanam, lumine et ratione naturali, sciri possunt. Hinc est quod illa est magis sapientia quam ista' (*QQ Metaph.*, ed. Dunphy, p. 361.75-87).

<sup>25</sup> 'Dicendum quod haec doctrina maxime sapientia est inter omnes sapientias humanas, non quidem in aliquo genere tantum, sed simpliciter. Cum enim sapientis sit ordinare et iudicare, iudicium autem per altiore causam de inferioribus habeatur; ille sapiens dicitur in unoquoque genere, qui considerat causam altissimam illius generis .... Ille igitur qui considerat simpliciter altissimam causam totius universi, quae Deus est, maxime sapiens dicitur .... Sacra autem doctrina propriissime determinat de Deo secundum quod est altissima causa: quia non solum quantum ad illud quod est per creaturas cognoscibile (quod philosophi cognoverunt, ut dicitur *Rom.* 1 [1:19]: *quod notum est Dei, manifestum est illis*); sed etiam quantum ad id quod notum est sibi soli de seipso, et aliis per revelationem communicatum. Unde sacra doctrina maxime dicitur sapientia' (*ST* 1.1.6c).

<sup>26</sup> 'Sic ergo quantum mihi videtur nunc, ipsae differunt in his sex iam dictis. Ex quibus iam dictis apparet quod pessime volunt procedere illi qui in illa scientia volunt procedere in omnibus modo demonstrativo. Principia enim demonstrationis debent esse nota via sensus, memoriae et experimenti. Principia autem illius scientiae nota sunt, ut visum est, per revelationem divinam' (*QQ Metaph.*, ed. Dunphy, p. 361.88-93).

Siger wants to keep the two theologies distinct not only in their objects but also in their methods. The demonstrative method to which he alludes is proper to philosophical theology or metaphysics and the other rational sciences. As described by Aristotle in his *Posterior Analytics*, this method is empirical, drawing its principles from sense perception. Aristotle writes:

... out of sense-perception comes to be what we call memory, and out of frequently repeated memories of the same thing develops experience; for a number of memories constitute a single experience. From experience again — i.e. from the universal now stabilized in its entirety in the soul, the one beside the many which is a single identity within them all — originate the skill of the craftsman and the knowledge of the man of science, skill in the sphere of coming to be and science in the sphere of being.<sup>27</sup>

The empirical demonstrative method cannot be suited to 'the theology that is sacred Scripture' because its principles do not come to us by way of the senses, memory and experience, but rather through a revelation from God. Siger does not deny that on occasion this theology may have recourse to the demonstrative method. What he protests against is the presumption that the method can be applied in *all* matters with which the science deals.

When Aquinas treats of the method of proof proper to sacred doctrine in article 8, he contends that the basis of sacred doctrine is faith in divine revelation, so that argument from authority is the method most appropriate to the science. Moreover, there is a hierarchy in the authorities used in sacred doctrine and in the value of its proofs. Its most appropriate authorities are those of canonical Scripture: arguments based on Scripture necessarily compel assent. An example is Paul's argument from the resurrection of Christ in proof of the general resurrection (1 Cor 15:12). It is also appropriate for sacred doctrine to appeal to the authority of the doctors of the Church, whose teaching is within the living tradition of revelation, but they do not have the probative value of Scripture. Arguments based on them are probable, not conclusive, for our faith rests on the revelation made to the prophets and apostles and not to others. Sacred doctrine, Thomas continues, also uses human reason, not to prove the faith, but to elucidate other matters taught in the science. Thus it appeals to the authority of the philosophers in matters in which they were able to arrive at the truth by natural reason; but Thomas insists that sacred doctrine makes use of philosophical authorities 'as extrinsic and probable arguments'.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>27</sup> Aristotle, *Post. Anal.* 2.19 (100a4-8) (Oxford translation). See *Metaph.* 1.1 (980b25-981a4).

<sup>28</sup> 'Ad secundum dicendum quod argumentari ex auctoritate est maxime proprium huius doctrinae: eo quod principia huius doctrinae per revelationem habentur, et sic oportet quod credatur auctoritati eorum quibus revelatio facta est. Nec hoc derogat dignitati huius doctrinae: nam licet locus ab auctoritate quae fundatur super ratione humana, sit infirmissimus; locus tamen ab auctoritate quae fundatur super revelatione divina, sit efficacissimus .... Et inde est quod etiam auctoritatibus



Siger's warning against the ubiquitous use of the empirical method of demonstration in sacred theology, and his insistence that it take its principles from the sacred Writings, is consistent with Thomas' description of the method of theology in his *Summa* and his commentary on the *De trinitate* of Boethius (2.1-3).

This completes Siger's comparison between the two theologies as it occurred to him at the moment: 'quantum mihi videtur nunc'.<sup>29</sup> As we have seen, all the differences between them can be traced to Thomas' *Summa* 1.1.2-8. Evidently Siger found nothing in the last two articles (9 and 10) of question 1, which have to do with the language and interpretation of sacred Scripture, to suggest further differences between the two kinds of theology.

Siger's sixfold differentiation of the two theologies enjoyed a certain popularity among subsequent commentators on the *Metaphysics*. It was taken up by at least two anonymous late thirteenth-century commentators and embodied in their replies to the question whether metaphysics can be called a divine science. These texts are edited in the Appendix at the end of the present study. Both contain Siger's six differences between the two theologies in the same order as C. The first calls sacred theology by the Sigerian term 'the science that is sacred Scripture'; the second calls it simply theology.

## II

It should now be clear that Siger takes from the *Summa* 1, q. 1 the essentials of what he calls 'the science that is sacred Scripture'. Like Aquinas' sacred doctrine, it is truly a science in the Thomistic sense of the word, with principles received from divine revelation, from which conclusions are drawn through reasoning and inquiry. The scope of the science is unlimited, embracing everything known through divine revelation or at least knowable in the light of that revelation. This includes the principles and conclusions of all the other sciences. Under the formality of divine revelation *sacra scriptura* can absorb within itself all the other sciences, as Thomas Aquinas brings them within the unity of sacred doctrine in his *Summa theologiae*.

It would be a mistake, then, to interpret Siger's term 'the science that is sacred Scripture' as simply the revealed Scriptures themselves, or a body of knowledge

philosophorum sacra doctrina utitur, ubi per rationem naturalem veritatem cognoscere potuerunt .... Sed tamen sacra doctrina huiusmodi auctoritatibus utitur quasi extraneis argumentis, et probabilibus. Auctoritatibus autem canonicae Scripturae utitur proprie, ex necessitate argumentando. Auctoritatibus autem aliorum doctorum Ecclesiae, quasi arguendo ex propriis, sed probabiliter' (*ST* 1.1.8 ad 2). See Gilby, *Summa theologiae*, Appendix 2, 2-3 (pp. 48-49).

<sup>29</sup> *QQ Metaph.* 6.1, ed. Dunphy, p. 361.88.

originating in divine revelation without formal reasoning.<sup>30</sup> Neither Siger nor Thomas applies the term 'science' to the content of Scripture just in itself. Siger explicitly describes the science he is writing about as having principles from which conclusions are reached through the effort of human reason. This corresponds to Aquinas' sacred doctrine in its scientific mode, as described in the first question of the *Summa* (2-8).

It seems paradoxical, however, and even contradictory for Siger to borrow his description of sacred theology so liberally from Aquinas in light of the notorious conflict between faith and reason in Siger's philosophy.<sup>31</sup> Thomas' conception of the theology presupposes the harmony of faith and reason and their intimate cooperation. For Aquinas, reason and faith cannot contradict each other for they are both gifts of God, who cannot lead us into error. Philosophy, which is based on the natural light of reason, cannot be contrary to the teachings of faith, which is a divine light added to natural reason.<sup>32</sup> The theologian, then, should have confidence in the conclusions of reason, even though by itself it is weak and prone to error. He should welcome them into his science as precious aids to his investigations. As we have seen, both philosophical principles and their conclusions can enter theology when they are viewed in the formal perspective of divine revelation. To the objection that the mixing of the teachings of philosophy with sacred doctrine is like diluting wine with water, Thomas serenely replies that bringing the works of the philosophers into sacred doctrine in the service of faith is not mixing water with wine but rather changing water into wine.<sup>33</sup>

Siger does not display the same confidence in human reason or the conviction of its harmony with the teachings of faith. He does not deny that philosophy sometimes reaches the truth, but he also believes that reason inevitably, or at least with some probability, leads to conclusions contrary to the faith.<sup>34</sup> In these cases he insists that truth is on the side of faith, thus avoiding the contradiction of a double truth.<sup>35</sup> When proposing doctrines contrary to the faith he sometimes

<sup>30</sup> T. P. Bukowski interprets Siger in this sense; see his 'Siger of Brabant vs. Thomas Aquinas on Theology', *The New Scholasticism* 61 (1987) 25-32.

<sup>31</sup> For Siger's views on philosophy and faith, see É. Gilson, *History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1955), pp. 389-99 and F. Van Steenberghen, *Maître Siger de Brabant* (Louvain-Paris, 1977), pp. 222-57.

<sup>32</sup> *Super Boeth. De trin.* 2.3 (ed. Decker, p. 94.3-21).

<sup>33</sup> *ibid.* ad 5 (p. 96.16-20). See Gilson, *Elements*, p. 29.

<sup>34</sup> For example, when treating of the question whether an eternal cause, like God, must produce an eternal effect, Siger writes: '... dico quod haec non est necessaria. Secundo, dico quod multa sunt credibilia et vera, quae, quia repugnare videntur magis manifestis, negata sunt; quare tunc non possem illud negare? Tertio, dico quod propositio probabilis est tantum, non necessaria. Quarto, quod ratio humana ducit in hoc quod debet negari' (*QQ Metaph.* 3.19, ed. Dunphy, p. 144.15-20; 3.6, ed. Maurer, p. 413.19-28). See Van Steenberghen, *Maître Siger de Brabant*, p. 234.

<sup>35</sup> E.g., on the question of creation Siger writes: 'Propter hoc sciendum quod sententia Philosophi ab his qui eius libros suscipiunt exponendos, non est celanda, licet sit contraria veritati. Nec debet

protests that he is only recording the teachings of the philosophers and not affirming their truth; at other times he alludes to the weakness of human reason and its inclination to err.<sup>36</sup> We may well ask under these circumstances how Siger could believe that the theologian can accept the conclusions of reason into his science.

The problem would perhaps be insoluble if we did not have evidence of Siger's doctrinal evolution and his progress toward Christian orthodoxy, mainly under the influence of Thomas Aquinas. The publication of his *Quaestiones super Librum de causis* — perhaps his last work, dated c. 1273-76 — makes it clear that Thomas' impact on his thinking toward the close of his career was, in the words of the editor, 'prépondérante et décisive'.<sup>37</sup> Not that the commentary on the *De causis* always agrees with the thought of Aquinas or abandons all the teachings for which Siger was cited to appear before the Inquisition.<sup>38</sup> But the presence of Thomas' *Summa* is evident throughout the commentary. As its editor says, some of the articles are simply summaries of corresponding articles in the *Prima pars* of the *Summa* and other Thomistic works.<sup>39</sup> Even prior to the *De causis* commentary Siger was led to question his stand on the unity of the intellect for all humans through Thomas' critique in his *De unitate intellectus contra Averroistas*. In the *De causis* commentary 'philosophical arguments are set forth for the plurality of the intellect which show the clear influence of Saint Thomas, and the views on

aliquis conari per rationem inquirere quae supra rationem sunt, vel rationes in contrarium dissolvere. Sed cum philosophus quantumcumque magnus in multis possit errare, non debet aliquis negare veritatem catholicam propter aliquam rationem philosophicam, licet illam dissolvere nesciat' (*QQ Metaph.* 3.5, ed. Maurer, p. 412.40-46). See Van Steenberghen, *ibid.*, p. 233; É. Gilson, *Études de philosophie médiévale* (Strasbourg, 1921), pp. 51-75 and *History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages*, pp. 398-99.

<sup>36</sup> Thus in his treatment of the notion of a cyclical return of civilizations, Siger writes: 'Haec autem dicimus opinionem Philosophi recitando, non ea asserendo tamquam vera' (*De aeternitate mundi* 4, ed. B. Bazán [Louvain-Paris, 1972], p. 132.85-86). For Siger, to philosophize is to discover what the philosophers have thought on a subject rather than the truth: 'quaerendo intentionem philosophorum in hoc magis quam veritatem, cum philosophice procedamus' (*De anima intellectiva* 7, ed. B. Bazán [Louvain-Paris, 1972], p. 101.7-9). Thomas criticized this notion of philosophy: '... studium philosophiae non est ad hoc quod sciatur quid homines senserint, sed qualiter se habeat veritas rerum' (*In libros Aristotelis De caelo et mundo expositio* 1.22 [Leonine edition 3.91a, no. 8]). For the inclination of human reason to err, see above, n. 35.

<sup>37</sup> *Les Quaestiones super librum de causis de Siger de Brabant*, ed. A. Marlasca (Louvain-Paris, 1972), p. 30. For the date of the commentary, see p. 28. F. Van Steenberghen dates it 1275-76 (*Maitre Siger de Brabant*, p. 218). R.-A. Gauthier has shown that Siger was influenced by Aquinas from the beginning of his career; see his illuminating study of Siger: 'Notes sur Siger de Brabant', *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 67 (1983) 201-32 and 68 (1984) 3-49.

<sup>38</sup> See Marlasca, *ibid.*, Introduction, p. 24. See also A. Zimmermann, 'Thomas von Aquin und Siger von Brabant im Licht neuer Quellentexte' in *Literatur und Sprache im europäischen Mittelalter. Festschrift für Karl Langosch zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. A. Önnersfors, J. Rathofer and F. Wagner (Darmstadt, 1973), pp. 437-45.

<sup>39</sup> Marlasca, *ibid.*, p. 22.

individuation and the nature of cognition which Siger presents show the same influence'.<sup>40</sup> In his *Quaestiones in Metaphysicam* he admits his mistake in assigning to the essence of matter the role of the principle of individuation. Correcting his error, he added to matter determined dimensions — a move that brought him into agreement with Thomas. He protests, however, that he changed his mind for his own reasons and not for those of anyone else.<sup>41</sup> In view of the established influence of the works of Thomas on Siger, especially the *Prima pars* of the *Summa*, it is not so remarkable that he took the main elements of his conception of sacred theology from the first question of the *Summa*.

This conclusion has recently been contested on the ground of Siger's separation of faith and reason. Though it is granted that he took some of his ideas and language from the *Summa*, the master from Brabant is said to have repudiated at bottom Thomas' ideal of theology.<sup>42</sup> Does not Siger deny that we should try to investigate by reason what is above reason, or to refute objections raised against the faith? ('Nec debet aliquis conari per rationem inquirere quae supra rationem sunt, vel rationes in contrarium dissolvere.'<sup>43</sup>) These restrictions on human reason would seem to deny the cooperation with faith demanded by Thomas' conception of theology.

It should be noted, however, that the first part of Siger's statement ('Nec debet aliquis conari per rationem inquirere quae supra rationem sunt'), far from being opposed to Thomism, is in fact taken from the *Summa*. In the *Prima pars* 1.1, Thomas establishes the necessity of a sacred doctrine over and above philosophy. The first opposing argument appeals to the scriptural injunction: 'Seek not the things that are too high for you' (Eccli 3:22). So one should not try to know what is beyond reason. Now philosophy adequately treats of matters within the reach of reason. Consequently any other knowledge besides philosophy is superfluous.

Ad ea enim quae supra rationem sunt, homo non debet conari, secundum illud *Eccli.* 3:22: *Altiora te ne quaesieris*. Sed ea quae rationi subduntur, sufficienter traduntur in philosophicis disciplinis. Superfluum igitur videtur, praeter philosophicas disciplinas, aliam doctrinam haberi.<sup>44</sup>

In reply, Thomas agrees that we should not try to inquire into matters beyond human knowledge; they should be taken on faith as revealed by God. And these are precisely the objects with which sacred doctrine deals.

<sup>40</sup> E. P. Mahoney, 'Saint Thomas and Siger of Brabant Revisited', *The Review of Metaphysics* 27 (1974) 551.

<sup>41</sup> 'Quamvis igitur praedictam viam quandoque tenerem, non alienis rationibus ductus sed propriis, errorem meum volo corrigere' (*QQ Metaph.* 5.20, ed. Maurer, p. 233.12-13; 5.1, ed. Dunphy, pp. 305.90-307.51).

<sup>42</sup> Bukowski, 'Siger of Brabant', 28.

<sup>43</sup> *QQ Metaph.* 3.5, ed. Maurer, p. 412.41-43.

<sup>44</sup> *ST* 1.1.1, obj. 1.

Ad primum ergo dicendum quod, licet ea quae sunt altiora hominis cognitione, non sint ab homine per rationem inquirenda, sunt tamen, a Deo revelata, suscipienda per fidem. Unde et ibidem subditur: *plurima supra sensum hominum ostensa sunt tibi*. Et in huiusmodi sacra doctrina consistit.<sup>45</sup>

For his present purpose of replying to the opposing argument Thomas does not have to qualify the biblical admonition not to inquire into things beyond reason. However, when he formally treats of the question whether it is permissible to investigate the divine mysteries, he makes it clear that a rational inquiry is not wrong in itself; indeed, it is permissible and even necessary. It is wrong only when one presumes to understand the things of God perfectly, or to do away with faith by bringing the divine mysteries down to the level of reason, or to stretch the investigation beyond one's individual capacity. The inquiry does not amount to a demonstration of the mysteries of faith but only to a persuasion of their truth through the use of analogies with the contents of faith.<sup>46</sup>

Siger also denies that the mysteries of faith can be demonstratively proven. He cautions that one should not rely too much on reason in these matters, for it easily leads to error in the realm of the supersensible. They are to be held as true on faith.<sup>47</sup> And yet, as we have seen, he does not rule out human inquiry in sacred science. Following Aquinas, he states that the theologian uses the method of human investigation to apply the principles known through divine revelation to other matters, which are as it were the conclusions of the science. Thus reasoning throws light on these other matters and by implication on the principles themselves;<sup>48</sup> but Siger does not explicitly say, as Aquinas does, that the use of reason in theology leads to a clarification of faith or *intellectus fidei*. We shall return to this important point in the conclusion.

One of the essential uses of reason and philosophy in theology, according to Thomas, is the refutation of arguments against the faith. If someone opposes a truth of faith and has no belief in divine revelation, he cannot be convinced of his error by appealing to the authority of Scripture. All that can be done, Thomas says, is to solve his difficulties by using rational arguments. Using the principles of philosophy, the theologian can refute his opponent's error by showing that it is either entirely impossible or that it lacks the force of necessity.<sup>49</sup>

In the text quoted above Siger seems to contradict Thomas on the possibility of refuting arguments against the faith. After stating that we should not try to know

<sup>45</sup> *ibid.* ad 1.

<sup>46</sup> *Super Boeth. De trin.* 2.1 (ed. Decker, pp. 82.8-83.11). See *ST* 1.1.8 ad 2.

<sup>47</sup> *QQ Metaph.* 3.16, ed. Dunphy, p. 136.86-87; 3.6, ed. Maurer, p. 413.25-28. See Van Steenberghe, *Maître Siger de Brabant*, pp. 234-35.

<sup>48</sup> *QQ Metaph.* 6.1, ed. Dunphy, pp. 359.19-360.26.

<sup>49</sup> *ST* 1.1.8; *Super Boeth. De trin.* 2.3 (ed. Decker, pp. 94.19-95.7).

what is beyond reason, he adds that neither should we try to refute arguments to the contrary in these matters: 'Nec debet aliquis conari per rationem inquirere quae supra rationem sunt, vel rationes in contrarium dissolvere.'<sup>50</sup> This statement, however, comes from P, which is the most abbreviated of all four manuscripts of Siger's *Quaestiones in Metaphysicam*. The parallel passage in C, which has a fuller account of Siger's mind on the subject, adds the qualification that human reason cannot refute *some* arguments against the faith, implying that in some cases it can.<sup>51</sup> Indeed, he himself has just shown that the philosophers' proof for the impossibility of creation *ex nihilo* is not demonstrative but commits the fallacy of begging the question (*petitio principii*). This proof, which according to Siger expresses the mind of Aristotle,<sup>52</sup> takes for granted that something with no potentiality to exist cannot be brought into existence. Whatever lacks the passive potentiality of matter has no potentiality to exist, and hence no agent can make it exist. But this does not do justice to the active power of an agent to bring something into existence. By this power alone a very powerful agent, like the First Cause, can bring something from absolute non-being to being. Failing to take adequate account of the active power of the agent, the philosophers are unable to settle the question of creation.<sup>53</sup> Siger probably received the key to his solution of the problem from Thomas Aquinas, who, while treating of the possibility of an eternal creation, distinguished between the passive potentiality of matter and the active power of God.<sup>54</sup>

Siger also thought the philosophers' proofs for the eternity of the world are not demonstrative but only probable, and they can be refuted by the metaphysician. The proofs presuppose that the primary Agent, or God, acts in the same way and under the same law of causality as agents in our own world, whereas in fact we are completely at a loss as to how the primary Agent acts. So we can make a mistake in applying the rule of causality to this Agent in the same way as we do to mundane causes.<sup>55</sup>

These are a few examples to show that Siger did not believe all philosophical arguments against the faith are irrefutable. Especially in his later works he tried to

<sup>50</sup> *QQ Metaph.* 3.5, ed. Maurer, p. 412.41-43.

<sup>51</sup> 'Et credo quod, sicut ea quae fidei sunt per rationem humanam probari non possunt, ita sunt aliquae rationes humanae ad opposita eorum, quae per humanam rationem dissolvi non possunt' (*QQ Metaph.* 3.15, ed. Maurer, p. 110.77-79).

<sup>52</sup> In fact, the notion of creation *ex nihilo* has no place in Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, since the separate substances are not efficient causes. See J. Owens, *The Doctrine of Being in the Aristotelian Metaphysics*, 3rd edition (Toronto, 1978), pp. 467-68.

<sup>53</sup> *QQ Metaph.* 3.15, ed. Maurer, pp. 108.20-110.72; 3.18, ed. Dunphy, p. 143.4-29; *Quaestiones in Physicam* 2.20, ed. A. Zimmermann in *Siger de Brabant. Écrits de logique, de morale et de physique*, ed. B. Bazán (Louvain-Paris, 1974), pp. 181.58-182.66.

<sup>54</sup> *ST* 1.46.1 ad 1.

<sup>55</sup> *QQ Metaph.* 3.16, ed. Maurer, pp. 113.89-114.4. For Siger's views on the eternity of the world, see Van Steenberghe, *Maître Siger de Brabant*, pp. 309-11.

find an accommodation between the conclusions of reason and the truths of faith. Despite his conviction, occasionally expressed in harsh terms, that reason sometimes goes counter to the faith, he did not deny all collaboration between faith and reason.<sup>56</sup> On this score it is not inconceivable that he accepted a theology that takes its principles from revelation and calls upon human reasoning and inquiry to develop the contents of revelation in a scientific way.

\*  
\* \*

Siger's brief remarks about sacred theology should be understood and evaluated in their context. His interest in the subject was not that of a theologian: he did not lecture on theology for its own sake, nor did he produce an extended treatise on it. He was a philosopher commenting on Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, and since Aristotle called his primary philosophy theological science,<sup>57</sup> Siger wanted to clarify the nature of the science by contrasting it with the theology contained in Christian revelation.

Though Siger's comments on sacred theology are brief, they are important for the current reevaluation of his relations to Christian faith, Thomism and Averroism. It is certain that he accepted not only the absolute truth of Christian revelation, even though he thought the conclusions of philosophy are sometimes contrary to it, but also the science of theology as a rational and scientific development of the data of revelation. For him, moreover, this theology is not only a science; it is wisdom itself, whose teachings have greater certainty than those of metaphysics.

Siger's concise excursus on theology in relation to metaphysics appears abruptly in his commentary on the *Metaphysics* as a casual reflection, without any pretense to being complete. He simply jots down six points of difference between the two kinds of theology as they occurred to him at the moment. The appearance of casualness, however, is deceptive, for the juxtaposition of the two kinds of theology has been done with skill and understanding. Moreover, Siger's choice of a description of theology to contrast with metaphysics could not have been more felicitous. No one in the thirteenth century made a more intelligent and creative use in theology of the newly discovered Graeco-Arabian science and philosophy than Thomas Aquinas. From Aristotle in particular he learned not only scientific methodology, which he applied by analogy to theology, but also (in Congar's words) 'a rational view of the world which in the mature work of Thomas Aquinas became the elaborate means of producing a human copy of God's science, which we know to be the ideal of his theology.'<sup>58</sup> In choosing to take his notion of

<sup>56</sup> See Van Steenberghen, *ibid.*, pp. 234-35.

<sup>57</sup> Aristotle, *Metaph.* 6.1 (1026a19).

<sup>58</sup> Congar, *A History of Theology*, pp. 108-109.

theology from the *Summa*, Siger contrasts metaphysics not simply with Christian theology but with the Thomistic doctrine of theology, as expounded in *Prima pars* 1.1. We have no way of knowing his attitude toward Thomas' fuller expression of this science in works like his commentary on the *De trinitate* of Boethius. Did he agree with Thomas not only on the role of reason in drawing new conclusions from the data of revelation but also on its function of throwing new light on the truths of faith, in short, that theology aims at an understanding of faith (*intellectus fidei*)?<sup>59</sup> He does not tell us; but we should not expect him to, for the question does not arise in the context of his treatment of theology.

Though influenced by Thomas both in his conception of theology and in his philosophy, Siger was no Thomist. The problem of the opposition of reason and faith troubled him until the end, although it was attenuated in his final work, the commentary on the *Liber de causis*. When reason appeared to conflict with faith, he placed truth on the side of faith, with the consequence that the value of philosophy as a work of human reason remained in question for him, as it never did for Thomas Aquinas. The progressive influence of Aquinas on his philosophy can no longer be in doubt, but even in his *De causis* commentary he is critical of certain Thomistic doctrines.<sup>60</sup>

Siger's comments on theology also show that in this regard he was not an Averroist. The Thomistic conception of the science of theology or sacred doctrine, adopted by Siger, is foreign to Averroes. It does not easily find a place in his scheme of the sciences. In his view the Koran teaches 'true science and right practice', but the philosopher alone, being capable of demonstrative knowledge, discerns the inner meaning of Scripture, which corresponds to the reality known to the philosophers. The Mutakallimūn (Mu'tazalites and Ash'arites), whom we generally regard as the Muslim theologians, cannot rise to demonstrative science, their powers of theoretical understanding having attained only to the level of dialectics.<sup>61</sup> Thus in the world of Averroes philosophers are an elite class with more natural ability and training than theologians. Siger, on the contrary, rates theology above metaphysics as possessing greater wisdom and certitude. A man of his own time and culture, he shared with the great Christian theologians of the thirteenth century a respect for, and an appreciation of, theology as the queen of the sciences.

<sup>59</sup> See *ST* 1.1.5 ad 2 and *Super Boeth. De trin.* 2.2 ad 4 (ed. Decker, pp. 88.24-89.4), ad 7 (p. 90.1).

<sup>60</sup> See above, n. 38.

<sup>61</sup> See *Averroes On the Harmony of Religion and Philosophy* 3, trans. G. F. Hourani (London, 1961), pp. 63-65 and Introduction, pp. 22-28. For Averroes' views on the relation of philosophy to religion, see: L. Gauthier, *La théorie d'Ibn Rochd (Averroès) sur les rapports de la religion et de la philosophie* (Paris, 1909) and *Ibn Rochd (Averroès)*, (Paris, 1948); M. Fakhry, *A History of Islamic Philosophy* (New York-London, 1970), pp. 307-15; G. C. Anawati, *Études de philosophie musulmane* (Paris, 1974), pp. 17-67.



APPENDIX<sup>1</sup>

## 1

## Anonymi Quaestiones super libros Metaphysicae Aristotelis

(MS. Vatican Library Vat. lat. 2173, f. 147rb-vb<sup>2</sup>)

(f. 147rb) Utrum scientia metaphysica possit dici scientia divina.

Et videtur quod non, quia illa scientia quae procedit per talia principia, modo naturali et lumine intellectus (f. 147va) naturalis cognita, est scientia humana et non divina. Sed <scientia> metaphysica est huiusmodi. Ergo etc. Maior patet, quia iste modus cognoscendi est humanus, procedere per principia cognita naturaliter et lumine intellectus. Ideo etc. Minor probatur, quia procedit per principia cognita via sensus, memoriae et experientiae, et per discursum ab illis principiis ad conclusiones; et huiusmodi est modus cognoscendi humanus. Ideo etc.

Hoc idem ostenditur secundo sic, quia quaedam est scientia sacra quae dicitur divina. Ergo, cum haec, scilicet<sup>3</sup> metaphysica, sit alia ab illa, et diversis non debet unum nomen imponi,<sup>4</sup> videtur quod haec non dicatur scientia divina.

Ad oppositum est Philosophus in littera, qui dicit quod tres sunt partes essentielles philosophiae, et una earum dicitur theologia, id est divina, ut dicit Commentator.<sup>5</sup>

Ad quaestionem est dicendum quod haec scientia, scilicet metaphysica, dicitur divina. Cuius ratio est quia entia <im>materialia et a materia<sup>6</sup> separata dicuntur divina. Quod apparet, quia Philosophus<sup>7</sup> dicit quod si divinum sit alicubi, tunc est in separatis a materia, scilicet de Deo et intelligentiis. Et hoc arguitur: scientia denominatur a subiecto et considerato<sup>8</sup> in ipsa. Sed haec scientia est circa divina et separata a materia sicut circa obiectum et consideratum. Ergo debet merito denominari ex subiecto et considerato et dici scientia divina.

Et confirmatur secundo. Honorabilissima scientia est circa honorabilissimum cognitum et consideratum. Sed haec <est> scientia metaphysica inter omnes alias, et practicas et speculativas, quod est finis omnium aliarum. Ergo sibi debetur nobilissimum consideratum, a quo denominabitur. Sed hoc est ens divinum, quod est causa omnium entium, quod est

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful to Professor William Dunphy for bringing these texts to my attention.

<sup>2</sup> This fourteenth-century manuscript is described in *Codices Vaticani latini. Codices 2118-2192*, ed. A. Maier (Vatican City, 1961), pp. 159-68. The text of the Quaestio edited here is very faulty and needs fairly extensive emendation; corrections are enclosed in angle brackets. Classical orthography has been introduced, and modern principles of punctuation and capitalization have been followed.

<sup>3</sup> haec scilicet: hoc sit MS.

<sup>4</sup> imponi: imponiri MS.

<sup>5</sup> Aristotle, *Metaph.* 6.1 (1026a19); Averroes, *In 6 Metaph.* (1026a19) c. 1 text (Venice, 1574) 8.146vg-h.

<sup>6</sup> materia: substantia MS.

<sup>7</sup> Aristotle, *Metaph.* 6.1 (1026a19).

<sup>8</sup> considerato: consideratur MS.

omnium entium<sup>9</sup> honorabilissimum, quia causa semper dignior est causato. Ideo haec scientia debet dici divina.

Sed notandum quod haec scientia metaphysica et<sup>10</sup> scientia quae dicitur sacra scriptura in multis differunt. Primo quantum ad modum considerandi, quia haec scientia<sup>11</sup> procedit per principia modo naturali et lumine intellectus naturali cognita, scilicet via sensus, memoriae et experientiae, et ex his probat conclusiones speciales <per> discursum rationis, et ille est modus humanus. Sed illa, sacra scriptura, non habet talem modum procedendi, sed procedit per principia non modo naturali sed divinitus cognita et revelata, ex quibus praesuppositis concluduntur conclusiones aliae in theologia. Ideo etc.

Secunda differentia est ex parte considerati, quia consideratum in hac scientia est ipse Deus et substantiae separatae quantum ad ea quae de eis possunt secundum humanam rationem investigari et inquiri. Sed in scientia sacra consideratur Deus etc. quantum ad ea quae modo <super>naturali et superhumano de ipsis inquiritur. Ergo etc.

Tertia differentia est quantum ad universalitatem, quia scientia quae dicitur sacra scriptura est universalior, ut videtur, quia haec, scilicet<sup>12</sup> metaphysica, considerat Deum et alia separata per ea per quae manuducimur<sup>13</sup> in cognitionem ipsorum.<sup>14</sup> Sed sacra scriptura est considerans de his et universaliter, et cum hoc etiam considerat<sup>15</sup> de his modo superhumano et supernaturali. Ideo est universalior. Ideo etc.

Quarta differentia est quia haec, scilicet metaphysica, est solum speculativa, sed sacra scriptura est non solum speculativa sed etiam practica, quia per ipsam docemur etiam exercere bonas operationes, et tales operationes per quas ad vitam aeternam possumus devenire. Ideo etc.

Quinta differentia est quia illa scientia, scilicet sacra scriptura, est certior, quia ex certioribus principiis,<sup>16</sup> divinitus scilicet revelatis, procedit quam haec, scilicet metaphysica.

Sexta differentia est quia, licet utraque, haec et illa, sit sapientia, tamen hoc est quia sacra scriptura est verior sapientia, quia veriori modo considerat de substantiis separatis et causis altissimis quam ista. Ideo etc.

Ad rationes patet solutio.

Ad primam, cum dicitur 'illa scientia quae procedit per <alia> principia' etc., verum est si non applicarentur ad entia divina. Sed si applicentur ad entia divina et perpetua, sic illa scientia poterit dici<sup>17</sup> divina, et haec est ratio huius. Ergo etc.

Ad secundam, cum dicitur 'quaedam<sup>18</sup> est scientia', verum est; 'cum<sup>19</sup> haec sit<sup>20</sup> alia',

<sup>9</sup> entium: quod est *add.* MS.

<sup>10</sup> et: est MS.

<sup>11</sup> scientia: quia *add.* MS.

<sup>12</sup> haec scilicet: hoc si MS.

<sup>13</sup> manuducimur: manuducuntur MS.

<sup>14</sup> ipsorum: ipsarum MS.

<sup>15</sup> hoc etiam considerat: hic etiam consideratur MS.

<sup>16</sup> principiis: scilicet *add.* MS.

<sup>17</sup> dici: de MS.

<sup>18</sup> quaedam: scientia MS.

<sup>19</sup> cum: sed MS.

<sup>20</sup> sit: est MS.

ideo etc., verum est. 'Ergo eis non debet dari unum nomen': verum est si<sup>21</sup> propter idem utrique imponatur et eodem modo consideratum. Sed unum <est> nomen divinum, sed aliter et aliter potest imponi, et sic est in proposito. Ideo etc. Vel aliter, quod unum et idem nomen non potest imponi diversis (f. 147vb) habentibus aliquod aliud nomen; sed diversis, quorum unum habet plura alia nomina, potest bene nomen unum imponi. Licet<sup>22</sup> scientia ista dicatur divina, tamen etiam potest dici metaphysica, philosophia prima, et sic de aliis. Et ideo ratio non concludit.

## 2

## Anonymi Quaestiones in libros Metaphysicae Aristotelis

(MS. Cambridge, Peterhouse 152, f. 4a-b<sup>1</sup>)

(f. 4ra) Quaeritur utrum ista scientia sit divina.

Videtur quod non. Scientia dicitur divina vel quia Deus habet eam vel quia est de divinis. Nunc autem Deus non habet scientiam istam, quoniam scientia est cognitio conclusionum per principia. Deus autem non habet cognitionem conclusionum per principia; talis enim cognitio est discursiva, quae Deo non competit, ut dicitur XII huius.<sup>2</sup>

Item, nec est de divinis, quoniam est alia quaedam scientia de his, quae dicitur theologia. Quare ista vel illa superflueret.

In oppositum est Aristoteles.<sup>3</sup>

Dicendum quod ista scientia divina est, primo quia Deus habet eam, quoniam quicumque habet cognitionem totius entis perfectissime, perfectissime dicitur habere scientiam istam, ex quo scientia ista est perfecta cognitio totius (f. 4rb) entis. Nunc autem Deus inter omnes naturas intellectuales perfectissimam habet cognitionem sui et aliorum entium. Ideo etc. Nihilominus possibile est quod Deus alium modum cognoscendi habeat in habendo cognitionem istorum entium quam aliae naturae intellectuales, quoniam scientia recipitur in cognoscente secundum possibilitatem cognoscentis. Quod si cognoscentia sunt diversarum naturarum, et cognitiones erunt diversae. Et ideo, cum Deus et aliae substantiae separatae sint naturae intellectualis diversae, ideo possunt eiusdem rei diversas cognitiones habere et alio modo. Et ideo, quamvis homo non cognoscat nisi componendo vel dividendo, non necesse est quod iste modus cognoscendi insit Deo.

Per hoc patet ad primum.

<sup>21</sup> si: sic MS.

<sup>22</sup> Licet: Sed MS.

<sup>1</sup> This late thirteenth- or early fourteenth-century manuscript is described in M. R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Peterhouse* (Cambridge, 1899), pp. 179-80. The unknown author also used Siger's question on essence and existence; see A. Zimmermann, 'Die Quaestio über Wesen und Sein aus einem anonymen Metaphysik-Kommentar des späten 13. Jahrhunderts', *Mediaevalia philosophica Polonorum* 16 (1971) 3-23.

<sup>2</sup> Aristotle, *Metaph.* 12.9 (1075a5-11).

<sup>3</sup> *ibid.* 6.1 (1026a19).

Ad secundum dico quod theologia et scientia ista non considerant de eisdem nec eodem modo. Differunt enim quantum ad modum considerandi, secundo quantum ad considerata, tertio quantum ad communitatem, quarto quantum ad finem, quinto quantum ad certitudinem, sexto quantum ad dignitatem.

Primum patet, quoniam scientia ista considerat de entibus divinis ex principiis cognitis lumine rationis humanae, sed theologia ex principiis lumine revelationis divinae.

Secundum patet, quoniam scientia ista considerat de entibus divinis, et solum quae per rationem humanam investigari possunt. Theologia autem considerat ea quae per rationem humanam investigari possunt et quae per revelationem sunt accepta.

Et ex hoc patet tertia conditio, scilicet quod alia theologia communior est quam ista, quia plura considerat, ut dictum est.

Quarto, differunt quantum ad finem, quoniam alia est magis practica. Considerat enim de entibus divinis quantum ad ea quae per revelationem sunt accepta. Revelabilia autem possunt esse practica et speculativa.

Quinto,<sup>4</sup> patet quod theologia certior est, quoniam est de his quae per revelationem divinam sunt accepta. Nunc autem in intellectu humano facilius cadit error quam in intellectu divino.

Item, est dignior, quoniam magis est de entibus divinis quam scientia ista, ut patet ex dictis. Et sic ad rationem patet solutio.

<sup>4</sup> Quinto: Sexto ms.

## THOMAS AQUINAS: DIMENSIVE QUANTITY AS INDIVIDUATING PRINCIPLE

Joseph Owens, C.Ss.R.

### I

SCHOLASTIC tradition has credited Thomas Aquinas with a distinctive stand on the much debated principle of individuation.<sup>1</sup> It regards his characteristic position as an offshoot of the doctrine expressed tersely in the words of Aristotle: '... this is Callias or Socrates; and they are different in virtue of their matter (for that is different), but the same in form; for their form is indivisible' (*Metaph.* 7.8 [1034a6-8]; Barnes trans.). Or again: 'But all things that are many in number have matter. (For one and the same formula applies to *many* things, e.g. the formula of man; but Socrates is *one*.)' (12.8 [1074a33-35]). Yet with Aquinas the tradition emphasizes significantly the way in which matter, in itself something common and without distinguishing traits, can function as the principle of individual distinction: 'And if one asks why their form is different, there will be no other reason than that it is in other designated matter. Neither can any other explanation be found why this matter is different from that except quantity. Consequently matter, as subject to dimension, is understood to be the principle of this diversity.'<sup>2</sup> In the context,

<sup>1</sup> 'Est ergo celebris sententia, affirmans principium individuationis esse materiam signatam. Haec est sententia D. Thomae ... Et existimatur haec sententia Aristotelis ...' (Suarez, *Disp. metaph.* 5.3.3 [5.162b]). On the customary formulation 'materia quantitate signata' see J. Bobik, 'La doctrine de saint Thomas sur l'individuation des substances corporelles', *Revue philosophique de Louvain* 51 (1953) 40 note 54. On the location of the doctrine in the history of Scholastic philosophy, see J. Assenmacher, *Die Geschichte des Individuationsprinzips in der Scholastik* (Leipzig, 1926), pp. 40-58; M.-D. Roland-Gosselin, ed., *'De ente et essentia' de s. Thomas d'Aquin* (Paris, 1948), pp. 104-34; J. R. Rosenberg, *The Principle of Individuation. A Comparative Study of St. Thomas, Scotus, and Suarez* (Diss. The Catholic University of America, 1950), pp. 16-58. For the Neo-Thomists, see I. Klinger, *Das Prinzip der Individuation bei Thomas von Aquin* (Münsterschwarzach, 1964), pp. 2-10.

<sup>2</sup> 'Sed si quaeratur, quare differens est eorum forma, non erit alia ratio, nisi quia est in alia materia signata. Nec invenitur alia ratio, quare haec materia sit divisa ab illa, nisi propter quantitatem. Et ideo materia subiecta dimensioni intelligitur esse principium huius diversitatis' (Aquinas, *Expositio super librum Boethii De trinitate*, ed. B. Decker [Leiden, 1955], 4.2 ad 4 [pp. 144.30-145.3]). The context of the passage is the way individual substances differ not only by accidents but also in their physical form and matter, with the different individual form explained by the different quantitative dimensions.

## THE LAND MARKET AT GODMANCHESTER c. 1300

*J. Ambrose Raftis, C.S.B.*

ALMOST by definition the feudal concept of society excluded the existence of a land market. In Marc Bloch's classical analysis the land market was not deemed worthy of special consideration and seems to have been considered under the general umbrella of a future study on later economic development.<sup>1</sup> Even in the later magisterial work of Georges Duby, the land market is given attention largely through evidence for the lord's control of the peasant.<sup>2</sup> For England, there has been a gradual shift in interest over the past two decades from issues of lordship towards accumulation of direct evidence for peasant land market activity. These new data have now been admirably assessed and complemented in the recent volume edited by P. D. A. Harvey, *The Peasant Land Market in Medieval England*.<sup>3</sup> Over the longer run the chief merit of this volume may lie in the stimulus it provides to further research. The following study based on evidence for Godmanchester is offered as a response to three points in particular: the question of the composition of holdings,<sup>4</sup> the issue of the chronology of the peasant land market<sup>5</sup> and those various 'speculative' considerations about the role of the family and the individual.<sup>6</sup>

### I

#### THE SOURCES

Around 1300 there are three sources for the study of the land market in Godmanchester, an ancient settlement across the Ouse River from the mediaeval

<sup>1</sup> Marc Bloch, *Feudal Society*, trans. L. A. Manyon (Chicago, 1961), p. 69.

<sup>2</sup> Georges Duby, *Rural Economy and Country Life in the Medieval West*, trans. Cynthia Postan (Columbia, S. C., 1968), pp. 238-42.

<sup>3</sup> Oxford, 1984.

<sup>4</sup> *ibid.*, pp. 16-18.

<sup>5</sup> *ibid.*, p. 20.

<sup>6</sup> *ibid.*, pp. 355-56. An invaluable methodological summary by P. D. A. Harvey of the sources for the study of the peasant land market has become available more recently. Cf. 'Il mercato contadino della terra nell'Inghilterra medievale', *Quaderni storici* N. S. 65 (1987) 379-96. Inter alia, in this article Harvey stresses that the more usual records of peasant land transactions give us only a partial view of the local land market, especially with respect to subletting.

borough of Huntingdon. The court rolls<sup>7</sup> of Godmanchester abound in references to conveyances of many small units of property. This type of information is familiar to scholars, although it has been perceived as evidence for the fragmentation of older tenements.<sup>8</sup> Godmanchester, a royal manor, also has its surviving 'feudal' record in a list of more than 400 tenants and their obligations in the Hundred Roll of 1279. What makes the following study more fully possible, however, is the use that now can be made of the 'subletting lists'. A recent, and as yet unpublished detailed study<sup>9</sup> of street locations from court roll entries suggested the location of tenants by streets within the 1279 Hundred Roll list. These suggestions are now confirmed for Post Street by the availability of a hitherto unknown list of tenants for that street.<sup>10</sup> The very existence of these three lists underlines the fact that the land market was nowhere recorded simply for its own sake. It becomes necessary, therefore, to discover first of all the administrative links between those two sources presenting an array of detail about small units of property and the formal 'feudal' units of tenure of the Hundred Roll.

The 'good men' of Godmanchester had been given a charter of liberties by King John in return for the payment of an annual farm of £120. When the royal commissioners for 1279 were asked in the spirit of such investigations to inquire 'what belongs to us', the response from Godmanchester was the annual farm. Individual payments to this farm were collected locally at Easter and Michaelmas. The 1279 Hundred Roll for Godmanchester is indeed quite simply a list of tenants along with their holdings and the farm payment exacted from holdings of that size. Such farm payment lists had to be drawn up for every Easter and Michaelmas collection. The 1279 Hundred Roll assessment depended upon local organization and for Godmanchester this could mean using the royal farm payment list.

The Hundred Roll commissioners for Huntingdonshire and Cambridgeshire completed their work between 12 March and 20 November 1279.<sup>11</sup> For Godmanchester this suggests that the Michaelmas 1279 farm list might be the most convenient. In fact, the use of the Michaelmas rental can be pinpointed from land

<sup>7</sup> Cf. J. Ambrose Raftis, *A Small Town in Late Medieval England: Godmanchester 1278-1400* (Studies and Texts 53; Toronto, 1982), Appendix 2, pp. 443-45.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Duby, *Rural Economy*, p. 240.

<sup>9</sup> This is part of a projected publication with the archaeologist of Godmanchester, H. J. M. Green, and the field expert of the region, David Hall.

<sup>10</sup> I am grateful to Mr. A. D. Hill, Senior Archivist of the County Record Office, Huntingdon, for drawing to my attention the discovery of some Godmanchester records in a Leicestershire house and making copies available in 1986.

<sup>11</sup> Information in this paragraph about the organization and timing of the 1279 Hundred Roll assessment is taken from E. A. Kosminsky, *Studies in the Agrarian History of England in the Thirteenth Century*, trans. Ruth Kisch (New York, 1956), pp. 13-17.

conveyance records. Among those surrendering small units of property in the three-weekly courts of Godmanchester from the court session after Easter to the court session the week before Michaelmas were 25 individuals who must have held no other properties since their names did not appear in the 1279 Hundred Roll as owing farm payments. On the other hand, immediately after Michaelmas names that are not on the Hundred Roll appear in courts as receiving property: Reginald son of Roger de Keston, Robert Presbyter of Huntingdon, Cristina wife of Robert Varnot and her daughter Agnes, Robert de Alconbury, William Sutor and many others. It seems clear, therefore, that despite the fact the dominant feature of the 1279 Hundred Roll is the low profile of the landholding pyramid with only three tenants holding more than 25 acres of arable, 77 tenants holding between ten and 25 acres, 107 tenants holding between five and ten acres and almost as many tenants holding fewer than five acres and frequently less than one acre, the Hundred Roll betrays little land marketing activity. The Hundred Roll does show that some tenants held only small units of land. But this roll does not reveal that many small tenants continued to enter and leave the land market. Nor does the Hundred Roll reveal the place of the small land unit in the estates of larger landholders.

The scope of the conveyance activity in the local court must be further assessed, then, in itself rather than in relation to the 'feudal' record, the 1279 Hundred Roll. Around the time of the 1279 Hundred Roll about 100 small units were being conveyed in the court over the period of one year, although the number of these conveyances tended to be fewer around 1279 than later. The following series compares the number of conveyance entries for the 23 courts prior to September 1279 with the 23 courts prior to September 1281. Totals for the latter series (190 as against 128 for 1278-79) tended to be typical of several subsequent years:<sup>12</sup>

June-December 1278: 18, 5, 0, 0, 5, 2, 2, 0, 1, 8, 8

June-December 1280: 2, 2, 3, 8, 7, 2, 11, 14, 13

January-September 1279: 8, 13, 5, 4, 6, 9, 0, 9, 17, 2, 1, 5

January-September 1281: 5, 10, 7, 21, 18, 17, 6, 7, 2, 2, 10, 5, 0, 8.

The 25 small holders who began to take up land after Michaelmas of 1279 were but a minute percentage of the total population dealing in small units of property.

Of greater significance still than annual variations in numbers of conveyances is the fact that the same properties are not conveyed year after year. The location of the small units of property are not given so that their reappearance cannot be traced. However, detailed testing of the personnel involved in court roll conveyances has indicated that holdings of a specific size were not placed on the market

<sup>12</sup> Of course the dates of court rolls vary from year to year and courts cannot be bracketed in parallel fashion for the two periods. The survival pattern for court rolls is not good between 1285 and 1295 (cf. Raftis, *Godmanchester 1278-1400*, Table 29, p. 444).



again in a few years or even after several years.<sup>13</sup> This would seem to imply that the conveyances were indeed sales. This is in fact confirmed when the general formula for surrender (*sursum reddidit*) was expanded from the time of the court of Michaelmas 1295, by identifying the land as having been purchased (*terra empti*). In short if one were to take 1280-81 as typical, over a period of some five years in the late thirteenth century some thousand small units of property were being conveyed in the Godmanchester court, a substantial portion in a manor of 5000 acres.

A basic question still remains: were all conveyances registered on the court rolls? The answer must clearly be no. It has been established that the people of Godmanchester tended to register conveyances on the local court rolls less often after 1300 than over the previous two decades.<sup>14</sup> But there were no byelaws requiring such registration at any time. Custom controlled the devolution of most family properties, so *a priori* there is no reason to believe that many families felt it necessary to use the courts to register conveyances all the time or even infrequently. Some ways in which the court roll was employed as a property register will appear below in the second section of the study.

That there were more conveyances than appear on court rolls can be established from those fragments tentatively described as 'subletting lists'<sup>15</sup> that survive only after 1300. The subletting lists were clearly designed to assist the collector of the farm who had responsibility for that street.<sup>16</sup> In other words, such lists would be used to update the rental obligations of the tenants at the Easter and Michaelmas terms by adding or subtracting the farm value of conveyances conducted since the last term. The data on these subletting lists are many more than the accumulated conveyance data to be found for one term at any time either before or after 1300 in court rolls.

There are no complete manuscripts for any one year for this third source of data about the land market, that is to say, subletting lists for all the streets are not extant in any one record.<sup>17</sup> Conveyances in the court rolls frequently identify tenants by

<sup>13</sup> This is further corroborated by the fact that there are references to short-term arrangements in the court rolls that are distinct from the conveyances under consideration here. For example, among the plea entries for the court record of 6 May 1281 is the entry: 'Memorandum quod Ricardus de Paxton habuit pacem de una roda terre locata de Helie Graunt usque ad terminum de duobus vesturis.' The names of neither Richard de Paxton nor Elias Graunt appear in conveyance records of the courts between 1278 and 1283.

<sup>14</sup> Raftis, *Godmanchester 1278-1400*, p. 444.

<sup>15</sup> *ibid.*, pp. 120-33. The term 'subletting' was employed to describe the internal evidence of these lists, that is, the form of entry in such lists simply indicates that property is held from the land (*de terra*) of the lessor.

<sup>16</sup> For a detailed discussion of this administrative procedure that may not have changed greatly over the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries see J. Ambrose Raftis, *Early Tudor Godmanchester: Survivals and New Arrivals*, chap. 1 (forthcoming).

<sup>17</sup> Actually there is no extant subletting list for East Street.

street. From such evidence it becomes apparent that the first street to be listed in the 1279 Hundred Roll, immediately after Merton Priory holdings at the beginning of the list of properties on the roll, is Post Street. The identification of Post Street tenants on the Hundred Roll can begin, therefore, with more certainty than for any other street. The recently acquired subletting list for Post Street (hereafter New List) clearly is earlier than the other complete list (List No. 2) for that street.<sup>18</sup> This New List has some 48 tenants who are the same individuals or heirs of tenants on the Hundred Roll. These tenant names on the New List serve to confirm the tentative division of the Hundred Roll from court roll data identified as Post Street.<sup>19</sup> In turn, 34 of the 75 names on List No. 2 are also to be found on the New List. But nearly all of the names on List No. 2 are from the same families as on the New List. These two lists must have been compiled within a few years of each other, therefore, and since List No. 2 is complete in the manuscript, the coincidence of names for the 'end of Post Street' on No. 2 with the same names for the New List suggests that the latter must also be complete or almost complete.

These lists are made up of terse entries: the tenant's name, the individual from whom the property was obtained and the acreage. For example, the first entry in the New List is as follows: 'Heredes Johannis filii Simonis Clerici. iiii. acras. Item de terra Broun. 1. rodam. Item de terra Johannis ate Re. 1. rodam.' The assessment value of the property by acre, or subdivision of the acre, was clearly known and would be entered in the final farm rent lists submitted to the collector for Post Street. When the property was not a measured unit of arable, pasture or meadow, the conveyed property was still given a measured assessment for sake of convenience. For example, the seventh entry in the New List begins as follows: 'Walterus Queneyeve de terra Ivet. iiii. rodas pro messuagio.' Often the property is simply given the farm tax paid by the previous tenant, especially when this was a small payment such as a halfpenny or farthing. As a result of all this, the subletting list leaves us with some conversion to the farm tax but with the majority of entries in land units still to be converted to farm payments.

There are 116 tenants given on the left side of the New List. These have obtained properties from 246 lessors. The total number of transactions in terms of separately identified units of property is 574. The size of these units may be seen in the following synopsis of the New List.

<sup>18</sup> Raftis, *Godmanchester 1278-1400*, List No. 2, pp. 125-27. The New List is now catalogued in the County Record Office as Godmanchester Court Roll BB/4. (See also further, n. 10 above).

<sup>19</sup> *Rotuli Hundredorum*, ed. W. Illingworth and J. Caley, Great Britain, Record Commission, 2 vols. (1812-18), 1.591, col. 2 from Phillip de la Barre to mid-col. 2 on p. 592 (Martin super le Wal).

*New List \**

Tenant	No. of Lessors	Units <sup>20</sup> Conveyed
heirs of John son of Simon Clerk	2	4a; 1r (2)
Thomas de [ ]	1	1d.
William son of Simon Clerk	4	6a 1r; 1a; $\frac{1}{2}$ a (2) 1r
Roger de Isliham	12	$\frac{1}{2}$ a 1r 2d; 2a; $\frac{1}{2}$ a; 1r (6); <i>ob.</i> [ ]
heirs of Simon Seman	1	$1\frac{1}{2}$ a
John Queneyve, butcher	3	$1\frac{1}{2}$ a; 1r (2)
Walter Queneyve	1	mess., $1\frac{1}{2}$ a
John Longe	7	3a 3r; 3r; $\frac{1}{2}$ a; $1\frac{1}{2}$ r; <i>ob.</i> ; <i>q.</i> ; [ ]
Thomas Queneyve	2	1r; <i>q.</i>
John son of Thomas Queneyve	1	1r
Roger Longe	13	mess.; 1a 1r; 3r; $1\frac{1}{2}$ r; 1r (5); $\frac{1}{2}$ r (5)
Simon Longe	2	1a; 1r
heirs of Gosceline Gildene	6	3r; 2r <i>ob.</i> ; $\frac{1}{2}$ a (3); 1r
Godfrey in the Lane	32	1a; 3r; $\frac{1}{2}$ a <i>q.</i> ; $\frac{1}{2}$ a (3); 2r (2); 1r (12); $\frac{1}{2}$ r (4); 2d; 1d <i>ob.</i> ; 1d <i>q.</i> ; 1d; <i>ob.</i> (4)
John Ede	3	1a 1r; 1a; $1\frac{1}{2}$ r; <i>ob. q.</i>
John son of Gosceline Gildene	3	$\frac{1}{2}$ r (2); <i>ob.</i>
Roger Manipenny	21	3a; $1\frac{1}{2}$ a; 1a; $\frac{1}{2}$ a (9); 2r; $1\frac{1}{2}$ r; 1r (4); $\frac{1}{2}$ r (2)
John Queneyve of London Street	22	$7\frac{1}{2}$ a; 3r; $2\frac{1}{2}$ r; $\frac{1}{2}$ a (2); $1\frac{1}{2}$ r 1d; $1\frac{1}{2}$ r (4); 1r <i>q.</i> ; 1r (7); $\frac{1}{2}$ r (2); 1d
heirs of Reginald Atebarre	2	4a; 1a; <i>ob. q.</i>
Reginald son of Thomas Balle	2	$2\frac{1}{2}$ a; 1r
Alexander Goni	4	$1\frac{1}{2}$ a (2); $\frac{1}{2}$ a (3)
heirs of Richard Elys	2	3r; $\frac{1}{2}$ r
John Elys, junior	2	$1\frac{1}{2}$ r; $\frac{1}{2}$ r
William Goni	1	$\frac{1}{2}$ a; $1\frac{1}{2}$ r
heirs of William de Wennington	2	mess.; 1a; $\frac{1}{2}$ a; 1d <i>ob.</i>
Godfrey Gildene	4	$\frac{1}{2}$ a; 1r (3)
Albrit Moregrove	7	1r (2); 1d (2); <i>ob.</i> (4)
Roger Warenter	1	$5\frac{1}{2}$ a
John de Graveley	4	$3\frac{1}{2}$ r; 1r 2d; $\frac{1}{2}$ a; 1r
Amicia daughter of Godfrey Gildene	1	1r
Elena Ede	1	2r

\* a = acre; mess. = messuage; r = rod; d. = penny; *ob.* = halfpenny; *q.* = farthing.

<sup>20</sup> There are a few small farm items in this column that may not be accurate since it is too complicated to reproduce references to different payments for each term, payments in part still owed by previous tenants and so forth.

John son of Adam Grinde	1	5r
Nicholas de Paxton	28	1 $\frac{1}{2}$ a ob.; $\frac{1}{2}$ a (3); 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ r (2); 1r (11); $\frac{1}{2}$ r (2); 1d.q. (2); ob. (6)
Henry Queneyve	1	1d.
John son of Alexander on the Wall	3	1r q. (2); ob.q.
Roger Faber	1	1 $\frac{1}{2}$ r
John atte Leirstowe	6	3a; 1a; 3d; 1r q.; 1r
William Manipenny	34	2a 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ d; 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ a (3); 1a (6); 3r; $\frac{1}{2}$ a $\frac{1}{2}$ r; $\frac{1}{2}$ a (5); 1r (14); $\frac{1}{2}$ r; ob. (4)
John Gile	18	3a; 1a; 2d. ob.; $\frac{1}{2}$ a; 1r (9); $\frac{1}{2}$ r; ob. (4); q.
Robert Gile	7	4a (2); 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ r; 1r; ob. (3); q.
Hugh Gile	4	4a; 1r; $\frac{1}{2}$ r; 1d.ob.; $\frac{1}{2}$ r
heirs of Simon Ingelond	10	1r; $\frac{1}{2}$ r; 1d. (3); 3q. (2); ob.; q. (2)
Robert Garlop	6	2r 1d.; 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ r; 1r; $\frac{1}{2}$ r; 3q.; ob.
Walter Ede	6	6a 1r; 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ r; 1r (2); $\frac{1}{2}$ r (4)
John Pykering	6	1 $\frac{1}{2}$ a; 1r (5)
Amicia Ede	2	1d.; $\frac{1}{2}$ r ob.q.; 1d.
heirs of Godfrey Glewe	5	$\frac{1}{2}$ a; 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ r (2); 1r; ob.
heirs of Godfrey Ivel		1a 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ r
John Pope	11	1a; 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ r; $\frac{1}{2}$ a; 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ r (2); 1r (3); $\frac{1}{2}$ r (2); ob.
Nicholas Stircup	1	$\frac{1}{2}$ a
Godfrey on the Wall	4	$\frac{1}{2}$ a; 1r; $\frac{1}{2}$ r (2)
Richard Mercator	1	$\frac{1}{2}$ a
Emma Hucster		1r
John Cupper	1	1r (2); 2d
William Masoun		9 $\frac{1}{2}$ a
Godfrey Cokayn	5	1 $\frac{1}{2}$ a; 1r; $\frac{1}{2}$ r; q. (2)
Reginald de Alconbury	4	1a; $\frac{1}{2}$ a; $\frac{1}{2}$ r; ob. (2)
John Page son of William		1r
Lawrence Pelliparius	1	2d.
Robert ate Re		3 $\frac{1}{2}$ a
Godfrey atte Barre	4	3a; 1r; $\frac{1}{2}$ r (2)
John Balde		1r; ob.
William Page	2	2r; ob. (2)
William Bonis	10	1r (4); $\frac{1}{2}$ r; 1d.q.; ob. (3); q.
William Carpenter	2	1d.
heirs of Richard Scot	2	2 $\frac{1}{2}$ a 1r; $\frac{1}{2}$ a; $\frac{1}{2}$ r
Alice daughter of Richard Scot	3	1d. (2); $\frac{1}{2}$ r; ob.
Richard in the Lane	3	1a 1r; $\frac{1}{2}$ a; $\frac{1}{2}$ r
Eusebius in the Lane	1	4a; 1r
Walter de Stukeley, chaplain	3	$\frac{1}{2}$ a; 1r; q.

heirs of Godfrey in the Lane	3	2a; 1r; $\frac{1}{2}$ r
heirs of William son of Augustine		2a
John ate Barre	2	$1\frac{1}{2}$ a; $\frac{1}{2}$ r; <i>q.</i>
John Spicer	6	$1\frac{1}{2}$ a; $\frac{1}{2}$ a (2); 2r; 1r (2)
Reginald Balle, sutor	2	$\frac{1}{2}$ r; <i>q.</i>
Reginald Trumbold	3	2r; 1r (2); 1 <i>d.</i>
Edward Trumbold	2	$\frac{1}{2}$ a; 1r
Robert de Bluntisham	3	1r (2); $\frac{1}{2}$ r
John Scot	8	2a; $1\frac{1}{2}$ a; 1a; $\frac{1}{2}$ a (4); $1\frac{1}{2}$ r; 1r
Cristina Marewelle		5r
heirs of Godfrey Marewelle	1	1r; $\frac{1}{2}$ r
William Wistow	4	1r <i>ob.</i> ; 1r (4); $\frac{1}{2}$ r
Godfrey son of Reginald in the Lane	1	2a
Reginald in the Lane	4	$1\frac{1}{2}$ a; 5r; 3r; $1\frac{1}{2}$ r
Alan Miller	15	1a; $\frac{1}{2}$ a (2); 2r; $1\frac{1}{2}$ r (4); 1r (4); 1 <i>d.</i> (2); <i>ob.</i>
Thomas son of John	2	$\frac{1}{2}$ a; 2 <i>d.</i>
John Warenter	1	$4\frac{1}{2}$ a; $\frac{1}{2}$ a; $1\frac{1}{2}$ r; 1r; <i>q.</i>
William son of John ad Capud Ville	2	2a 3r; <i>ob.</i>
Emma Goni	1	2r
Reginald son of Edward Goni	3	$3\frac{1}{2}$ a; 1a; $\frac{1}{2}$ a <i>q.</i> ; 2 <i>d.</i>
heirs of Reginald son of John	2	6a; 1a; 2 <i>d. ob.</i> ; 1r
Robert de Cam		1r
John son of Reginald, senior	6	1a; $\frac{1}{2}$ a; $1\frac{1}{2}$ r; 1r; $\frac{1}{2}$ r; 1 swath
William Colyon	9	4a; 1a; 2r $\frac{1}{2}$ a; $\frac{1}{2}$ a (4); 1r (2); $\frac{1}{2}$ r (2); <i>ob.</i> ; <i>q.</i>
Reginald son of Nicholas	8	1a; $\frac{1}{2}$ a; 1r; $\frac{1}{2}$ r; <i>ob.</i> (2); <i>q.</i> (3)
Gilbert son of John	2	$5\frac{1}{2}$ a $\frac{1}{2}$ r; $\frac{1}{2}$ a; 1r
Henry son of John	1	4a; <i>ob.</i>
Eusebius Mundeford	3	$\frac{1}{2}$ a; 6 <i>d.</i> ; 1 <i>d.</i>
Margaret Mundeford	1	$\frac{1}{2}$ r
Felicity Gyleman		$\frac{1}{2}$ a
John Brond		1r
Robert le Small	10	3a; 3r; $\frac{1}{2}$ a <i>q.</i> ; $\frac{1}{2}$ a (5); $1\frac{1}{2}$ r; 1r; 6 <i>d.</i> ; <i>ob.</i>
Simon Persoun	3	$\frac{1}{2}$ a (2); 1r; <i>ob. q.</i>
heirs of Super Montem	4	2a; $\frac{1}{2}$ a; $1\frac{1}{2}$ r; 1r; $\frac{1}{2}$ r
John son of Richard Chapman		1a
John Miller	12	$1\frac{1}{2}$ a; $\frac{1}{2}$ a 1r; $\frac{1}{2}$ a (7); $1\frac{1}{2}$ r; 1r (2); 1 <i>d.</i> ; <i>ob.</i>
heirs of Richard de Lincoln	6	1r (4); 3 <i>d.</i> ; 1 <i>d.</i>
Gilbert Goni	1	$\frac{1}{2}$ a
Thomas, Robert, Gilbert, Margaret, children of Edward Goni	4	1a; $\frac{1}{2}$ r; <i>ob.</i> ; <i>q.</i>

John son of William Manipenny	5	$\frac{1}{2}$ a; 1r (2); 8d.ob.q.; ob.
Richard son of Reginald son of Eustace	1	1r
John Maryny	7	3r; 2r; 1r (5)
Godfrey Manipenny	2	$\frac{1}{2}$ a (2)

The List No. 2 data for Post Street are fewer than data from the New List: 75 tenants involved in 296 transactions. But despite the fact that List No. 2 data must have been compiled within a few years after the New List, the transactions are different. This seems to verify the fact that subletting lists were compiled for each farm payment term. On the other hand, detailed checking has not been able to establish that the subletting lists summated transactions from court rolls, along with transactions not to be found on court rolls, for the convenience of the collector of the farm. The possibility remains, therefore, that there may have been an intermediate list between the subletting list and the final farm payment list for the term that included both data from the court roll and from the subletting lists. Alternatively, of course, court roll data may simply have been added or subtracted from the margin of the farm rent list available from the previous term, a practice to be found in late fifteenth-century Godmanchester.<sup>21</sup>

In any case, as we shall see in the next section, the structure of the property market revealed by court rolls and subletting lists was very much the same. What remains significant throughout these sources is the immensity of the market. For Post Street was not unique and thereby to be explained by the fact that this was the commercial centre of the town. Surviving data for Arnyng and West Streets are comparable:

Arnyng Street	List No. 1	List No. 2	List No. 3
	—	66 tenants	42 tenants
		315 lessors	126 lessors
		347 properties	136 properties
West Street	55 tenants	47 tenants	
	291 lessors	165 lessors	
	340 properties	169 properties.	

In order to appreciate further the nature of this property market it should be noted that nearly all the larger land units, those holdings from two to seven and one-half acres in the New List above, are not listed as purchases. It is the small units of land, with the highest frequency those of one rod, that predominate: assuming the missing East Street data to be comparable to Post Street, some 1000 such units were conveyed at the time of List No. 2. A further characteristic of the

<sup>21</sup> Raftis, *Early Tudor Godmanchester*, chap. 1.

land market is the fact that the sellers, or lessors in the data above, were several times more numerous than the tenants<sup>22</sup> on these lists. In short, nearly all lessors sold only one small property in one list. The differential between the number of properties and the number of lessors is to be explained by the number of properties without designated lessors and the number of lessors who have sold more than one property. The latter is not great: only some 15 for the Post Street New List. It is not always easy to identify lessors whose names have been repeated, since the scribe in a few instances leaves us with the surname only. So the number of lessors, especially for Arnyng and West Streets where identifications are more difficult, must be seen as estimations with a possible five per cent margin of error.

## II

### THE STRUCTURE OF THE LAND MARKET

Sources for the study of the land market at Godmanchester have been presented in section I above simply to reveal the breadth of the personnel involved in the market as well as the sizes and types of properties that were marketed. It has also become clear that the three sources represent neither three necessary administrative stages nor fully complementary records. Rather, each record represents a distinct purpose in itself even though the overall rationale of the administration was to maintain control of data required for assessment of the royal farm. As a result each source throws different light on the nature of the land market and taken all together these sources reveal much of the dynamic structure of the market.

Historians have long been generally agreed that land was the main and the most desirable form of wealth in late medieval England, as in later periods. That land was normally marketed in those small units found for Godmanchester is information that has not been readily available.<sup>23</sup> Leaving aside for a moment the question of land use, a very real issue when one recalls that almost all the small units were arable, it will be illustrated that this supply system made land available for a wide variety of social and economic purposes.

It has already been noted in the previous section that a number of new names appeared as purchasers of land over the months after the 1279 Hundred Roll was drawn up. Such new names would continue to be a feature of the court rolls. No

<sup>22</sup> On the other hand the tenants are fewer than the total tenants to be expected from the Hundred Roll, a factor of possible significance for the engrossing by lease to be discussed below.

<sup>23</sup> There is a vast amount of extant information about transactions in small units of land, for example, in charters of East Midland estates, but these do not appear in a context that makes possible some assessment of the market structure.

doubt the hundred and more tenants of smallholdings listed at the end of the Hundred Roll were in great part the result of such market activity. The list of 52 tenants from the neighbouring villages of Hemingford, Offord and Papworth, as well as Huntingdon, holding land from 24 lessors, according to a subletting list of the 1320s,<sup>24</sup> gives us another expression of the demand for the small units. Some of these latter tenants living beyond Godmanchester were heirs and widows of Godmanchester people; others were of substantial wealth as indicated by their leasing a dozen or more properties; but by far the greatest majority leased only a rod or two. Some of this majority were identified as tradesmen and the majority of those leasing or purchasing a rod or so would appear to be from the less wealthy labouring and tradespeople of the town or abroad. Unless these individuals were able to establish a family in the town it is unlikely that they could retain even small bits of property for longer than their productive working period. We have already seen in the first section that many such small holders were selling off their properties over the months prior to the 1279 Hundred Roll.

Examples of the use of small units of land by the less wealthy level of tenants vary widely in the circumstances to be found in the court rolls. Nicholas, son of William, had only one acre of land in 1279. His circumstances evidently did not improve greatly by 1308 when he conveyed one of the lowest assessment property units, a place, in gift to his children William, Matilda, Albrida, Elena and Sybil. Nicholas had purchased this place from Mabel Colyon and her unnamed sister. On the other hand, a John Startle who in 1279 held only a rather insignificant unit called a *divisa* (no doubt the pasture on some land divide such as a balk), while two others by the same surname held only one messuage and one acre respectively, seems to have accumulated more for his family. His son John received a messuage and unspecified lands. One daughter, Matilda, received 12 'beddis' of meadow from the will of her father in 1308 and five 'beddis' in gift from her mother during the same year. In 1309 Matilda received one rod of arable and one rod of meadow by her father's bequest. During the year 1311 Matilda received a sequence of gifts from her mother: two crofts, one croft, a 'piece' of herbage and one-half swath of meadow. During the latter year another daughter Isolda received in gift from her mother four properties consisting of two units of one rod each, 12 'cris' of meadow and a 'swath' of meadow.

As we move up the scale of wealth, the regular involvement of an individual in the small land market becomes increasingly a function of special family circumstances rather than a general phenomenon of that level of wealth. In short, fewer members of those more substantial families were involved regularly in the small unit of land market. Nicholas Drew, with eight acres of arable in the 1279 Hundred Roll, gradually gave up bits of land over the 1290s. But Nicholas had no male heir

<sup>24</sup> Raftis, *Godmanchester 1278-1400*, pp. 131-32.



and this greater wealth was gradually dissipated over a longer period into the fourteenth century. By contrast, Nicholas Kuter who had nine acres in 1279 saw his relatives increase to some 20 over the next two generations, and a vigorous policy of purchasing small properties when and where available was undertaken to support this numerous progeny. On the other hand, the family of In The Lane had four branches in 1279 with a good property base: 11 acres, 9 acres, 3 acres, 3 acres. The family expanded in branches and numbers over the next two generations even more than the Kuters and exploited the small property market to do so. The Glewe family with two reasonably affluent tenants (10 acres, 8 acres) and two smaller tenants (4 acres, 1 messuage) in 1279 followed the same pattern.

Some general consequences of this family policy have been described elsewhere. First of all, in the 1279 tenurial map there were peculiar patterns of larger holdings juxtaposed with small tenants often with the same surname as the larger tenant.<sup>25</sup> These were to be found on all levels of wealth. Examples have been given above for the In The Lane and Glewe families. An example on a poorer level of wealth might be the 1279 Hundred Roll entry for Godfrey Engelson senior with a messuage followed by entries for Godfrey Engelson junior and Simon Engelson, each holding one rod. Secondly, the thrust of family policy expressed itself in various specific ways, such as the concern by mothers for the support of unmarried daughters by gifts.<sup>26</sup> These family management policies have now become rather familiar in the work of scholars, especially through the analysis of the last will and testament.<sup>27</sup> Our analysis of the land market at Godmanchester requires us to turn to another question.

It is surprising to find such a wide spectrum of wealth taking advantage of the land market. Since engrossing has been a common phenomenon throughout history, why then were the small units of property not simply gobbled up by those with more available capital? An answer to this question seems to lie in two features of the land market: first, the evidence that isolated units of land tended to be released to the market only gradually over several years; and secondly, a rather obvious desire on the part of wealthier townsmen to accumulate land over a brief period of time.

To deal with the sale of land first. There are dozens of examples of an ongoing policy of selling land over a number of years. In some instances the period covered by these sales could be quite long, as with Phillip atte Barre who sold one rod in 1280, a pennysworth of rent and one-half acre in 1283, a built place in 1284, a

<sup>25</sup> *ibid.*, pp. 95-99.

<sup>26</sup> *ibid.*, pp. 23-25.

<sup>27</sup> For a recent assessment of this facet of peasant life, cf. Barbara A. Hanawalt, *The Ties That Bound. Peasant Families in Medieval England* (Oxford, 1987), especially chap. 2.

threepenny rent in 1286, another half acre in 1288, 20 'cris' of meadow in 1295, another half acre in 1297 and in 1298, one croft, 20 'cris' of meadow and other lands. John Batayle senior sold 16 pieces of property over the last ten years of his court appearances. The phenomenon occurs frequently for women. Isolda Binde-water released six small units of property over the nine years before her name disappears from the records. Amicia Baroun left six properties before releasing her messuage to her son John. Helen Buldir sold three small properties prior to leaving four more by her will.

Such evidence confirms the view that small units of land were commonly sold for maintenance over the declining years of the tenant's life. The home would be the last to go, as with Amicia Baroun noted above, and the example of Godfrey Richer who sold eleven properties before selling his messuage. The story of William Bonis is more complete, for we know that he sold off pieces of property for five years prior to releasing his messuage to his son John for a maintenance arrangement.<sup>28</sup> Individuals who found it necessary to sell off small pieces of property were not always from the most substantial families of the town. Phillip atte Barre had about four acres and Helen Buldir three acres in the 1279 Hundred Roll. There is no evidence that the other individuals given in the examples of the previous paragraph held more than five acres of land. On the other hand, there is plenty of evidence that this selling off of small units of property was the last act of full financial independence by ageing men and women upon many levels of wealth. Examples of individuals abound: Bartholomew Aylward, Nicholas son of Augustine, John Balle, Godfrey Balle, Robert Clerk, William Clerk, Simon Legge, John son of Gilbert, Simon Das, John Drew, Robert Danlys and his wife Matilda, Thomas Goni, Osbert Seman and his wife Alicia, Ivo in Venella (or in the Lane), John Vecharen, Robert Warenter, William Warenter, Reginald le Walse and his wife Mariota. That independence to be found through property was important for the ageing couple or the surviving spouse.

While the availability of small units of land for purchase was too irregular to serve the purposes of the large scale engrosser, small units of land could serve a purpose from time to time for special family needs dictated by demographic factors irrespective of the main family wealth. The most common instance occurs from tenants who did not want to sacrifice the main family estate to sons and daughters often still living at home.

Again, however, the great variety of existential circumstances possible to a family could bring exceptions. It has already been noted that Nicholas Drew gradually dissipated nine acres apparently owing to the fact that he did not have an heir. One branch of the large and wealthy Goni family, represented in 1279 by William Goni with more than 13 acres, let all its land go around 1300. The apparent reason for

<sup>28</sup> For the text of this agreement, see Raftis, *Godmanchester 1278-1400*, pp. 30-31.

this was the fact William had only three daughters to succeed him; a son William surfaces vaguely on the records and very likely died young. Exactly the same sequence was to be found for John Pellage who had three daughters and a son Henry who only appears in records for a brief period of time. Godfrey Pademor also released much land around 1300, although his family circumstances are not so clear.

A more complex situation occurred when a family from outside Godmanchester had established a successful branch in the town but the heir was an outsider equally successful abroad and with no desire to take up residence in Godmanchester. John, son of Andrew Buxston, of Huntingdon inherited land from his father in 1296. Andrew Buxston had settled in Godmanchester and in the 1279 Hundred Roll was one of the wealthier tenants of the town with 20 acres of arable and three acres of meadow. John Buxston apparently wished to remain resident in Huntingdon and so was obliged to release the greater part of his Godmanchester inheritance. This giving up of his inherited properties and all title to properties is well documented in the court rolls. Conveniently, several other individuals who gradually gave up their holdings after a successful lifetime in Godmanchester had place names: de Essex, de Hartford, de Paxton, Grantesden and Hamerton.

There were two categories of occupations at Godmanchester that were the exception to the rule insofar as these were able to follow a policy of engrossing. The first of these were merchants. One suspects that the credit and debt arrangements of the time made possible a considerable and regular accumulation of small units of property by merchants.<sup>29</sup> In any case, there are individuals associated with merchant activity who gained control of considerable land in this fashion. Adam Grinde has already<sup>30</sup> been singled out as the best documented example of this. Since this was a period when occupational names most frequently signified activity in the occupation, no doubt merchant activity is indicated by such land engrossers as Richard Garlop and John le Spicer (or Apothecarius). Merchant involvement had attracted outsiders to Godmanchester and would explain the rapid accumulation of land by Godfrey son of William de Oundle and perhaps several of those outsiders noted in the previous paragraph who had settled successfully in the town.

The second category of engrossers were the clerics in major orders, that is to say, not those families assuming the surname Clerk but those whose occupations were most commonly designated as chaplains. Examples of this phenomenon have already been published from the land purchases of Reyner Vicory and Roger de Strateshill.<sup>31</sup> Regular access to so many smallholdings may have come from the rôle of the priest as dispenser of spiritual 'payments' for property. Such is specified in

<sup>29</sup> Unfortunately there are practically no informative data about debts in court rolls for this period. Such data became a significant part of late fifteenth-century court records.

<sup>30</sup> Raftis, *Godmanchester 1278-1400*, especially p. 196.

<sup>31</sup> *ibid.*, p. 72.

a 1306 entry: 'Be it noted that William Millicent junior, executor of the will of John Millicent, surrendered into the hands of the bailiffs one and one-half rods of meadow to provide services ... the same meadow will belong to whoever performs those services in that place after the death of Roger ....'<sup>32</sup> Normally there is no reference to spiritual services and indeed the same court entry merely noted that in addition Roger obtained seisin of one rod of meadow, one rod of arable, one and one-half rods of arable, one-half acre of arable, and rents of a halfpenny twice, twopence (twice) and two shillings from eight different individuals. Such larger numbers of small leases had occurred for Reyner Vicory in 1280, 1281, 1282 and 1283 as well as much larger numbers for Roger de Strateshill in 1291, 1292, 1295, and 1306 with lesser amounts for most years up to the 1320s. And there were other chaplains with smaller numbers of lands.

All in all, the number of smallholdings released from families by conveyances to merchants and clergy would be significant. The will of Roger de Strateshill registered in the court of 1297 reveals that he had accumulated 30 acres of arable and four acres of meadow. Equally significant for the market supply of smallholdings was the fact that these accumulations of land by merchant or cleric tended to be dispersed after the lifetime of the tenants to a greater degree than for other individuals. For the merchant the reason for this was the regional nature of the merchant's family which, together with pressure from Godmanchester customs to reduce alien control of town property, lead to the reallocation of Godmanchester smallholdings. Because of the laws of celibacy clerics had to be continually recruited from abroad. Some of these left properties to relatives, as with Vicory and Sommenour. William atte Quene simply left 14½ acres to the town and Roger de Strateshill tried to reallocate lands under spiritual titles. But efforts to retain lands by clergy were clearly not long-standing for, unlike other major tenants, their names quickly disappeared from the mention of previous tenants that was frequently to be found in a court conveyance as a method for better identification of properties.

There were very many and very complex explanations, then, for the continuing supply of and demand for one or a few small units on the land market at Godmanchester. On the other hand, the reason why there was less dependence upon petty trade and land is a second feature of the market that appears to be straightforward and more simply demonstrated. Wealthier people owned larger amounts of land and bequeathed, inherited and purchased land in blocks of several acres. Examples of these blocks can be found in published accounts of inheritance policies at Godmanchester.<sup>33</sup> In the Subletting List for Post Street summarized

<sup>32</sup> *ibid.*, pp. 47-48.

<sup>33</sup> *ibid.*, pp. 42, 43, 45, 204, 212. Such blocks were normally conferred by will or gift and outside the court. Lawsuits brought most of these cases to court. The references here refer to units of 21 acres arable, 2½ acres meadow; 7 acres arable; 2 acres meadow; 11½ acres arable; 39 acres of arable (in blocks of 6 and 3 acres) and 18 acres of arable.

above all those properties held by individuals from wealthy families and designated 'as his own' were acreage blocks of land: 6;  $5\frac{1}{2}$ ;  $4\frac{1}{2}$  (four times);  $3\frac{1}{2}$ .

The term 'block' of land is employed here to indicate the size of the assessment unit given in records. Such an expression must not be taken to imply contiguous pieces of land in the open fields. At the end of September 1301, Felicity daughter of Godfrey le Clerk was given by her father a messuage and land assessed for the farm at five acres. These five acres are described and make up more than 18 separate units of property. No doubt because the family had branches in both Godmanchester and Huntingdon, the le Rede family carefully recorded their transactions in the Godmanchester court. This remained one of the wealthiest families over the late thirteenth century and the first half of the fourteenth century. In consequence, this family supplies us with a good pattern of the short-term receipt and divestment policies of the large property holder.

In 1293 William le Rede received land 'formerly his father's': 1 messuage, 1 croft, 1a 3r,  $\frac{1}{2}$ a,  $\frac{1}{2}$ a, 3 butts, 1r,  $\frac{1}{2}$ a,  $\frac{1}{2}$ a,  $\frac{1}{2}$ a,  $\frac{1}{2}$ a,  $\frac{1}{2}$ a, 1r, 1r, 1r, 3 gores, 1r, 3r,  $\frac{1}{2}$ a, 2 butts,  $\frac{1}{2}$ a,  $1\frac{1}{2}$ r, 1r,  $\frac{1}{2}$ a, 3r, 1r,  $\frac{1}{2}$ a, 1r,  $\frac{1}{2}$ a,  $\frac{1}{2}$ a, 1r,  $\frac{1}{2}$ a,  $\frac{1}{2}$ a,  $\frac{1}{2}$ a,  $\frac{1}{2}$ a, 1a meadow,  $1\frac{1}{2}$ r,  $\frac{1}{2}$ a, 1 piece,  $\frac{1}{2}$ r, 1r,  $\frac{1}{2}$ r, 1r, 1 dole, 1r,  $\frac{1}{2}$ r, 1r,  $1\frac{1}{2}$ r, 1 piece, along with these came  $1\frac{1}{2}$  acres from his mother. It is rather an anticlimax that William later purchased on the 'normal' market from Isolda Julian and Godfrey her son one croft assessed as one rod. In the year 1294, Simon son of Roger le Rede received 28 units by bequest. In 1306 William, son of Martin le Rede senior of Huntingdon, received 22 small units from Ralph Clerk described as 'his brother'. In the same year Mabel le Rede received 11 units of property. During 1316 William son of Roger le Rede received more than 20 units of property. The Redes pursued a more aggressive policy than other wealthy families by purchasing small units of land that became available on the market but in numbers and size the latter were insignificant by comparison with the blocks noted above.

While isolated and small pieces of property were not central to the plans of wealthy families, even the purchase of a few such units reveals the opposite condition among the poorest level of tenants. The Julian family noted in the previous paragraph were poor and gradually disappearing as tenants.<sup>34</sup> Someone called Mercer in the 1279 Hundred Roll and Mercator in the court rolls was a smallholder. He does not seem to have established a homestead for more than one generation. When the wealthy William Goni purchased one-half acre after 1300, the court roll merely noted this purchase as from the daughters of Mercator without naming these. Richard Das was a smallholder with a messuage, two acres of arable and one-half rod of meadow in 1279. In 1294 Richard conveyed a messuage and one-half rod of arable to his son Simon. Almost apologetically the entry notes that a swath of meadow was not included in this gift since Richard had

<sup>34</sup> *ibid.*, pp. 148-49.

sold this meadow to Alan, father of Henry Rode who now has the meadow. Even by 1279 Henry Rode was one of the wealthiest landowners.

On the whole, accumulated information about land transactions bears little relation to the actual amount of land held by wealthier tenants. Some wealthy families, like the Millicents of West Street, appeared only rarely in the court rolls. For other families, such as the Manipennys,<sup>35</sup> the number of transactions to be found on court rolls is in great part a function of a family with several prosperous and numerous branches. There were Herbert, John and William in 1279 with lands respectively of 13, 20 and 24 acres. Over the next forty years the Manipennys sold little land on the market as registered in the court rolls. Most of the many entries in the court rolls reflect the increase in size of these families. John alone had nine children, three sons and six daughters. Almost half of the twoscore court roll entries suggest a recording of interfamilial arrangements rather than open market purchases. Even for the latter the court roll entry is usually terse to the extreme. A court roll entry for January, 1301, touching on the affairs of the wealthy families of Clerk, Pellage and Reginald son of Robert, gives us a rare glimpse of what more detailed realities might have been like. In that court an entry informs us that Reginald son of Robert conveyed a messuage to Henry, Thomas, Gilbert and Cristina, sons and daughter of Thomas son of Benedict. Reginald had purchased this messuage from William, John and Robert, sons of Simon Clerk. Reginald also released to Henry, Gilbert and Cristina (the latter in one-half acre units) one acre each. One acre was also given to Thomas, one-half acre of this having been brought from the wealthy John Pellage and the other one-half acre bought from the land of poor Robert Cokayn.

As has been noted in section I above, the subletting lists were more immediately directed to the end of the accounting term than the court roll entries that were spread over the whole term. Because of this concentration of entries, the subletting lists tend to bring into focus more clearly those various family strategies that one might expect to find over a lifetime. For the New List of Post Street lands a wife is a lessor twelve times, a father nine times, a brother eight times, a mother five times and a sister once. The reception of land from the father would indicate that the son has arrived at the age when he could legally hold land. These land units tended to be larger than the average (1a, 1a, 1r, 2a, 2a, 3r, 3a) though there is no means of knowing how these units had been acquired by the father and the three units that have been shown to be purchased are small (1r[2], 2r). These smallholdings without messuages or houses correspond to those smallholdings to be found in the Hundred Roll of 1279, often entered after a large holding by someone with the same surname.

<sup>35</sup> *ibid.*, Table 25, pp. 212-13, for variations in purchase and sale of land units as found in court rolls for the Manipenny and nine other families.

As a son moved towards establishing his own household his property might be acquired from other members of his own family. A myriad of family circumstances could indictate these conveyances. But our samples may be too small to indicate more than a few possible patterns. Conveyances by mothers tended to be around one acre, or above average. Leases from brothers varied all the way from the one messuage and one croft obtained by John Warenter from his brother William and the messuage obtained by Reginald Goni from his brother William to a halfpenny worth of land and four small units ( $\frac{1}{2}$ r (2),  $1\frac{1}{2}$ r, 1r (2)) and one and one-half rods from a sister.

When the son married the land market could obviously supplement the wife's dowry. On the whole, however, since Godmanchester records are casual about the use of such technical terms as dowry, it is impossible to establish a clear relationship between such official family arrangements and the data from our three sources. That there was such a relation is implied by the entry indicating that Roger Manipenny had obtained from his wife one-half acre of land worth halfpenny in farm assessment and that this land had formerly belonged to her father. It is difficult not to see more substantial properties obtained from wives (a messuage and three acres by Robert le Small, four acres by Hugh Gile and a messuage by John Miller) as part of family marriage arrangements. But the other ten entries for this category vary from two acres to a rod, so that their role in family arrangements is not so obvious.

Court roll data have sometimes been registered at critical periods of the life cycle so they tend to confirm the marketing and use of small units of land given in the previous three paragraphs. During 1294 Isolda, widow of John, received three small units of meadow called 'cris', a 'place', one and one-half rods of meadow and one-half acre of arable all formerly owned by her father. She was also confirmed that year in the possession of four acres of arable received as a free marriage gift as well as eight acres coming to her as heiress. By 1308 Isolda was releasing land to her son John who was probably coming of age. The court roll entry specifies that John received one acre of arable that his mother 'has for life from John Thrumbold her husband' and he also received the three units of meadow (alternatively called 'beddis') in gift from his mother.

As we have seen in section I above, the New List for Post Street conforms with other lists<sup>36</sup> insofar as none of these entries is to be found on court rolls. The fact that the Subletting Lists, except for references to one's own land, were genuine leases would explain, therefore, why there was a clear possibility for that pattern of homestead support during the life cycle. In this respect subletting complemented those central family arrangements that involved limited ownership. Such, for example, was the use of the dower by the husband and the frequent tenure of other

<sup>36</sup> *ibid.*, p. 120.

lands (whether or not dower is not specified in court rolls) from the heir for the lifetime of the widow.

But the generic policy of leasing would also seem to have made possible considerable engrossing. In the Post Street New List the 34 units leased by William Manipenny, the 21 units leased by Roger Manipenny, the 32 units leased by Godfrey in the Lane and the 22 units leased by John Queneve are to be expected in the light of these numerous and well propertied families. Nicholas de Paxton was from one of those obviously wealthy families and his tenure of 28 leased units was clearly complementary to an aggressive policy of smallholding purchases revealed by the court rolls. The Millers, Alan with 15 units and John with 12 units, are interesting insofar as they were recorded on the court rolls as purchasing many smallish pieces of property over the years 1315-16. Perhaps their occupation gave them a special advantage over these years of famine! Such use of leases was a family policy, as revealed by the 18 units held by William Manipenny in List No. 1, and the 18 units held by the heirs of William Manipenny in List No. 2. Nicholas de Paxton had 11 units in List No. 1 and 19 in List No. 2. Multiplying of leases is also to be found for such wealthy families as le Rede and Rode that we have met in previous pages. Also, those successful tradesmen such as Adam Grinde (25 units) and Reginald Spicer (25 units) demonstrate that the Millers were not unique.

Whether properties were owned or leased was a matter of indifference to the collectors of the tax for the royal farm. Leasing arrangements were a matter of private contract. In this respect Godmanchester did not differ from manorial estates throughout the region where leasing for a harvest or two was allowed.<sup>37</sup> Such contracts would seem to have been honoured very well for we only have about a dozen references in the courts to such agreements. These references do serve to inform us that leasing could also be for 5, 6, 8, 10½ and 12 years.<sup>38</sup> An inquisition report refers to one such customary arrangement.<sup>39</sup> Whether pressures of poverty were forcing poorer tenants to extend this leasing beyond their lifetime, or such arrangements facilitated the securing of revenues for widows, daughters and minors, cannot be established from these few samples.

\*  
\* \*

Given the relatively recent historiography of the land market for pre-1348 England, more questions are perhaps raised than resolved by this study of

<sup>37</sup> For such short-term subletting on the neighbouring manors of Ramsey Abbey, see J. Ambrose Raftis, *Tenure and Mobility. Studies in the Social History of the Mediaeval English Village* (Studies and Texts 8; Toronto, 1964), pp. 74-81.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Raftis, *Godmanchester 1278-1400*, pp. 119-20.

<sup>39</sup> 'Isti iurati dicunt quod quilibet tenens de curia de Gomecestre si indigiat legare potest unam acram terre sue ad terminum decem annorum cum [...] et hoc viderunt et ubi sunt multis temporibus.'



Godmanchester. Nevertheless some conclusions appear to be forthcoming. First, there was an active and extensive land market in thousands of pieces of property over the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. There is no conceivable way of assessing the total acreage involved in the land market so that it is not possible to deduce the proportion of the total land of the town available to the market. Since small units of land could be leased for various numbers of years and for life as well as for sale, there is no reason to believe a significant percentage of all land was not available to the market. Nor is there a *prima facie* social reason why much land should not be available to the market, perceived in this wider sense of lease as well as sale, since the right of inheritance by the main heir was focussed on the retention of the capital messuage rather than total property control.<sup>40</sup>

Secondly, this market was in great part possible only because land was available for purchase, sale and lease in small units. In terms of viable economic use, one might have expected that the property market would focus largely on distinct messuages, crofts, curtilages, and those distinguishable subdivisions of meadow such as the swath, 'cris' and 'beddis'. But in fact over 99 per cent of the small units on the market were arable. In our current state of knowledge about the open field system of cultivation it is ridiculous to presume that the three main fields of Godmanchester were broken up into cultivable half rods and rods of arable. And yet such rods and half-rods are described as located in every field and every part of the three fields.<sup>41</sup> The only conceivable answer to this conundrum is to acknowledge that the land market of Godmanchester is concerned with ownership and leasehold rather than use. This was a further way of accommodating the elastic nature of the open field system that we have come to appreciate more fully from recent scholarship.

The distinction between ownership and the use makes more comprehensible two basic economic and social realities of the time. First, since security lay in the ownership of property a wide array of persons who were prevented from farming

<sup>40</sup> Raftis, *Godmanchester 1278-1400*, pp. 216-28. On this point, Godmanchester data would seem to support the seminal suggestion of Paul R. Hyams that there should be no real distinction between husbandry and mortgage lease; cf. 'The Origins of a Peasant Land Market in England', *The Economic History Review*, 2nd Ser., 23 (1970) 30-31. The useful volume, *Land, Kinship and Life-Cycle*, ed. Richard M. Smith (Cambridge, 1984), appears to treat leasing as a peripheral question, perhaps owing to the concentration upon manorial court rolls as sources. Cf. *ibid.*, p. xi.

<sup>41</sup> Throughout the court rolls, lands in the open fields of Godmanchester were identified in relation to topographical features rather than furlongs. Transactions in small units of land, averaging more than one rod and increasing in size over the fourteenth century, have been amply demonstrated for East Anglia. Cf. Bruce M. S. Campbell, 'Population Pressure, Inheritance and the Land Market in a Fourteenth-Century Peasant Community' in *Land, Kinship and Life-Cycle*, pp. 87-134 and Richard M. Smith, 'Families and Their Land in an Area of Partible Inheritance: Redgrave, Suffolk 1260-1320', *ibid.*, pp. 135-96. But the issue of land management would still appear to await consideration by these scholars.

for lack of resources or by commitment to alternative occupations were able to find some land as collateral. From the petty shopkeepers<sup>42</sup> to those such as the Tinctors from the cloth trade in Huntingdon,<sup>43</sup> every effort seems to have been made to purchase land. Historians are well aware of the practice of merchants' investing in land because of the classical studies of this phenomenon in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century England. But the role of credit in local town and peasant life has just begun to be investigated.<sup>44</sup> As yet we are hardly in a position to appreciate the importance of land as a credit base for such little people as the Mercator family in late thirteenth-century Godmanchester.

It may be significant, however, that those such as labourers and petty tradesmen, who were extended credit by others whom they serviced<sup>45</sup> and who were often more wealthy, were able to obtain some land. A wide array of questions that cannot be answered by this evidence arises from this issue. For example, did the availability of small units of land perform such a function in the traditional economy that less liquid capital was necessary? Was 'ownership' of land in the 'feudal' mentality of the time of less exclusive concern in the thirteenth century than in the late fifteenth century and onward?<sup>46</sup> Whatever the full explanation of this phenomenon, the manner by which levels of households perdured among the less wealthy at Godmanchester may take us one step further in understanding this general phenomenon in rural Huntingdonshire.<sup>47</sup>

Thirdly, despite all the dealing in small units of property, the 1279 Hundred Roll and the subletting lists make quite clear that a concentration of wealth continued among various families over these two generations. In short, Godmanchester had its own version of several tiers of household size as did the manorial villages of the countryside with their few tenures of more than one virgate and the widespread holding of virgates and half virgates and cotlands.<sup>48</sup> It takes no great stretch of the imagination to realize how these wealthier levels were retained. Sharecropping is capable of a wide variety of applications. That sharecropping

<sup>42</sup> Raftis, *Godmanchester 1278-1400*, p. 193.

<sup>43</sup> Eleanor Carus-Wilson produced the classical work on the spread of this trade to and from such country towns as Huntingdon. Cf. her study, 'An Industrial Revolution of the Thirteenth Century', *The Economic History Review* 9 (1941) 39-60 and the important revisions by Edward Miller in 'The Fortunes of the English Textile Industry in the Thirteenth Century', *The Economic History Review*, 2nd Ser., 18 (1965) 64-82.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. the pioneering study of Elaine Clark, 'Debt Litigation in a Late Medieval English Vill' in *Pathways to Medieval Peasants*, ed. J. Ambrose Raftis (Toronto, 1981), pp. 247-82.

<sup>45</sup> *ibid.*, p. 261.

<sup>46</sup> Certainly ownership became a more exclusive concern and possibility for the wealthier levels of late fifteenth-century Godmanchester; cf. Raftis, *Early Tudor Godmanchester*, chap. 6.

<sup>47</sup> Edwin Brezette DeWindt has called attention to this feature of the rural economy in *Land and People in Holywell-cum-Needlingworth. Structures of Tenure and Patterns of Social Organization in an East Midlands Village, 1252-1457* (Studies and Texts 22; Toronto, 1972), chap. 3.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. Kosminsky, *Studies*, pp. 215 f.

existed in some form is evident from the earliest extents and surveys where one finds references to 'sown acres' as part or all of the payments for some service or other. With the survival of maintenance arrangements in thirteenth-century charters and court rolls, and in more detail from the wills that become extant later, the main heir is frequently found responsible for cultivating specified units of land and making certain amounts of the harvest available to other surviving members of the family. David Herlihy's presumption that the distribution of household size remained fairly stable in countries of northern Europe as well as in the Mediterranean world<sup>49</sup> seems to be vindicated by the Godmanchester experience where mothers, fathers, brothers and sisters could lease to the one responsible for the main productive unit of the household. Furthermore, the larger landholders demonstrated a capacity for continuing control over the productivity of smallholdings of many less wealthy sectors of the society by the leasing of many small units at one time.

Despite all these built-in structures and strategies the supply of and demand for land remained extremely volatile. The life cycle of the family was a major component in the chronology of the land market. On the less wealthy levels of society this feature of the market was to be explained by the fact that the capacity to purchase and retain land was personal, that is, tied in directly to the productive period of the labourer, petty artisan and small tradesman. For the more wealthy people, this feature was also perpetuated by the personal element, illustrated most dramatically by the sale of land by parents or surviving parent in order to retain as long as possible some independence during their declining years. But more fundamental still was the chronic imbalance in the system owing to the fact that family sizes in this pre-industrial society were so uneven. On the one hand, a large number of families regularly failed to replace themselves. On the other hand, a significant number of wealthy families dissipated their resources among an increasing number of branches over several generations.<sup>50</sup> The time was still far distant when family succession policies with the assistance of such devices as the trust could guarantee a more lasting estate.

<sup>49</sup> *Medieval Households* (Cambridge, Mass., 1985), especially chap. 6. The remarks here merely touch the surface of the problem. Questions about reasons for differentiation between levels of wealth (e.g., *ibid.*, pp. 141, 155) have hardly begun to be investigated.

<sup>50</sup> Raftis, *Godmanchester 1278-1400*, pp. 161-63. *Faute de mieux*, various scholars have attempted to break out of the formal strictures of feudal historiography by framing new data on the peasant economy within such available concepts as Chayanov's family acquisition theory, Polanyi's embedded economy theory, 'commercialism', 'individualism' and so forth. Inevitably, recent studies are rendering such terms anachronistic. However, it does not seem suitable that these larger methodological issues be addressed within the context of a study of one estate.

*OCELLI NOMINVM:*  
NAMES AND SHELF MARKS  
OF FAMOUS/FAMILIAR MANUSCRIPTS (III)

*Wilma Fitzgerald, S.P.*

THE following pages continue the list of manuscripts which began as an aid for students of art history in locating codices frequently cited by a familiar name and not always by the shelf mark.

The present *Ocelli nominum* follows the same principles governing their presentation as the list published in *Mediaeval Studies* 45 (1983) and 48 (1986):

(1) English is the principal working language and names and terms are usually given in their English equivalent. Thus the words Heures, Bibbia, Evangelia, Sacramentarium are given as Hours, Bible, Gospels, and Sacramentary. A few commonly used Latin names are noted, as *Biblia Gregoriana*.

(2) Manuscripts to be identified with an author are grouped under the simple English name of that author, such as Livy, Hrotsvitha, and the manuscripts are numbered individually a), b), c), etc. If the manuscripts listed for this author begin with b), or c), then one or several manuscripts are given for that entry in the first or second list. Literary manuscripts without a known author, like the *Infancy Gospels*, are entered in the same manner.

(3) Where several *ocelli nominum* designate a single codex, there will be a main entry listing all forms and given usually under the name first in alphabetic order, with cross-references thereafter. The main entry for the *Robert de Genève Missal* will be *Coëtiwy, Alain de, Missal* and the = sign indicates other names. However, if the second alphabetic name is the more common, it will be the main entry form. Thus the main entry for *Codex Solmsianus* will be *Klitschdorf MS*. Slight variations in spelling are indicated in parentheses. The sign — indicates a name which is seldom used or different enough so as to be misleading to one not acquainted with the codex. No other entry is given for this name.

(4) If two or more codices have the same name, they are numbered 2), 3), etc. beneath the main entry.

(5) To simplify entries, 'Hours of', 'Pontifical of' and similar generic terms follow the proper name. An exception is 'Codex' which if transposed presents an uncommon expression.

(6) 'Saint' as a title of respect is abbreviated 'St.' and placed after personal names (thus *Louis, St., Psalter*). As a geographic term, 'Saint', 'San', 'Sankt' is used as required.

(7) When a manuscript is written entirely or to a large extent in a language other than Latin, its language is indicated in square brackets placed after the name.

(8) Names of libraries that have been abbreviated in the list are cited in full in the Index of Manuscripts on pp. 343-48 below.

(9) The shelf marks given for all entries derive from examination of manuscript catalogues, correspondence with librarians, and scholarly studies, recent and past. Care has been taken to ensure that they are accurate and current. Occasionally two shelf marks are given, that is, both old and new, as, for example, in the case of the Trinity College, Dublin manuscripts where the serial numbers in T. K. Abbott, *Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin* (Dublin-London, 1900) are now preferred to the older press marks. The citation of both is not intended to sanction use of the obsolete number or combination of both, but rather to aid in identification of a particular codex. For this reason *olim* shelf marks are given in some instances when a manuscript has recently changed location.

Numerous other named manuscripts are doubtless missing from this list either because they or their present location are unknown to me. I shall be grateful for suggestions regarding manuscripts which should be included as well as for notice of errors and inaccuracies.

Special thanks must go to many keepers of manuscripts who have provided information about shelf marks and current locations. Deserving of lasting gratitude are those authors of manuscript studies who cite their famous/familiar codices precisely. Again, I am indebted to Dr. Sigrid Krämer of the Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften for names and happily for corrections.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| Abravanel Pentateuch [Hebrew]                  | Almanzi, Joseph, Portuguese Pentateuch |
| Oxford, BL: Opp. Add. 4° 26                    | [Hebrew]                               |
| Admont ms. (Decretum Stephani regis            | London, BL: Add. 17167                 |
| Hungaricae)                                    | Alspach Gospels                        |
| Budapest, OSK: c.l.m.ae 433                    | Stuttgart, WLB: Bibl. qu. 71           |
| Albert von Sternberg Pontifical                | Amedée VIII (of Savoy) Hours           |
| Praha, PNPS: DG 1 19                           | Stuttgart, WLB: HB I 175               |
| Alexander Romance ( <i>Roman d'Alexandre</i> ) | André de Ryneck Wappenbuch             |
| [French]                                       | Wien, ÖNB: 3336                        |
| e) Paris, BN: fr. 790                          | Angilberga Psalter                     |
| f) Paris, BN: fr. 1590                         | = Codex purpureus c)                   |
| Alice de Reydon Hours                          | Piacenza, BC: Comunale S.N.            |
| Cambridge, UL: Dd.4.17                         | Anne de Bretagne Hours                 |
| Alix de Ville-sur-Ilion Lectionary             | 2) - Très petites heures of Anne de    |
| Paris, BN: nouv. acq. lat. 2288-2289           | Bretagne                               |
|  | Paris, BN: nouv. acq. lat. 3120        |

- Anne la Routye Hours [Latin and French]  
Sydney, SU: S.N.
- Arenberg Psalter  
Paris, BN: nouv. acq. lat. 3102
- Arthur III, Duke of Brittany, Hours  
New York, PM: M. 241
- Astor Psalter  
= Elizabeth de Bohun Hours and Psalter  
Ginge Manor (Oxfordshire), Viscount Astor Collection: S.N.
- Ayrardus (Airard) de Saint-Thierry Epistolar  
Reims, BM: 250 (C. 158)
- Baillet, Jean, Pontifical  
Manchester, JR: Lat. 142
- Barn(e)well Cartulary  
London, BL: Harley 3601
- Baturich von Regensburg Pontifical  
Wien, ÖNB: Ser. n. 2762
- Beatrix, Queen, Hours  
Melk, SB: 1845 (olim 1860)
- Beauvais Sacramentary  
Malibu, JPM: Ludwig V 1
- Berlanga Pentateuch [Hebrew]  
Oxford, BL: Canon. Or. 77
- Bessarion, Cardinal, Missal  
Vaticano, Città del, BAV: Barb. lat. 562
- Biblia Gregoriana  
= Canterbury Gospels  
London, BL: Royal 1.E.vi
- Bigot Roll of Arms  
Paris, BN: fr. 18648 (fols. 32r-39v)
- Blaeu Hours  
Chicago, NL: 53
- Bohuse, Symonne, Hours  
Tours, BM: 221
- Bonivard Missal  
Genève, BPU: lat. 30 b
- Boskovic Bible [Czech]  
Olomouc, UK: M III 3
- Bourrée de Château Gontier Hours  
Paris, BN: nouv. acq. lat. 3179
- Butler Hours  
Baltimore, WAG: W. 105 + Stockholm, NM: B 1726-27
- Buxheim Organ Book  
München, SB: Mus. 3725
- Calais Bible *historiale* [French]  
Paris, BN: fr. 152
- Calendar of Mamert Fichet  
New York, PM: M. 897
- Cambridge Catalan Bible [Hebrew]  
Cambridge, UL: Mm.5.27
- Canterbury Gospels: see Biblia Gregoriana
- Cantigas de Santa Maria* of Alfonso el Sabio (X) [Galician]  
1) El Escorial, BSL: j.b.2 (j.B.2; B.I.2)  
2) El Escorial, BSL: T.j.I (T.J.1)  
3) Firenze, BN: Banco rari 30 (Magl. II 1 213)  
4) Madrid, BN: 10069 (olim Tol. 103-23; Hh 73)
- Carlos VIII Hours  
Madrid, BN: Vitr. 24.1
- Catalan Atlas of 1375 [Catalan]  
Paris, BN: esp. 30
- Catherine de Lambour Hours  
Genève, BPU: Ariana 5
- Catherine de Montbozon Hours  
Vesoul, BM: 27
- Charles V Bible  
Paris, BA: 590
- Charles V Bible *historiale* [French]  
1) Cambridge (Mass.), HU: fMS Typ 555  
= Houghton Bible *historiale*  
2) Paris, BA: 5212
- Charles d'Albret Bible *historiale* [French]  
= Cardinal d'Estrées Bible  
= Papeleu, (Jean de), Bible  
Paris, BA: 5059
- Charlotte of Savoy Hours  
Forth Worth (Texas), Arthur Haddaway Collection: S.N.
- Chevalier, Étienne, Hours  
2) London, BL: Add. 16997
- Chotěšov Missal of 1350  
Praha, SK: XIV C 3
- Chronicles  
a) *Chronica de gestis Hungarorum*  
Budapest, OSK: c.l.m.æ 404  
b) Peterborough Chronicle of Walter of Whittelsey  
London, BL: Add. 39758
- Clairambault Chansonier: see Songbooks I 1)
- Clare Psalter: see Vescy Psalter

## Clement VII Hours

Genève, BPU: lat. 151

Clement VII Missal: see Coëtivy, Alain de, Missal

Clerk, John, Miscellany [French]

London, BL: Harley 273

Codex Ardmachanus: see Codex Kilkeniensis

—— Basini: see Seneca b)

—— Bavarus

München, SB: Clm 44 (Cim. 5)

—— Cizensis: see Lycophron a)

—— Cruserianus: see Seneca b)

—— Insulensis

= Codex Inisensis

= Codex Insula Sanctorum

= Codex Lochriensis

Oxford, BL: Rawl. B. 505

—— Kilkenniensis

= Codex Ardmachanus

Dublin, ML: U.3.4

—— Melisseus: see Seneca c)

—— Pithoeanus: see Phaedrus

—— purpureus

c) Angilberga Psalter

Piacenza, BC: Comunale S.N.

d) d'Épinal

Épinal, BM: 201 (265)

e) Bruxelles, BR: 61 (II.175)

—— Rorigonis: see Glanfeuil Bible

—— Salmanticensis

Bruxelles, BR: 3179 (7672-4)

—— Solmsianus: see Klitschdorf ms.

Coëtivy, Alain de, Missal

= Clement VII Missal

= Robert de Genève Missal

Paris, BN: lat. 848

Coverham Abbey Prayer Roll: see Rolls a)

Creméaux (Cremeaulx) Hours

London, BL: Add. 18751

Crèveœur Bible [French]

Paris, BM: 312

Croftys, Thomas, Bible [French]

Cambridge, UL: Ee.3.52

Cunliffe Hours

Utrecht, BR: 8.L.20

Dante [Italian]

d) Piacenza Dante

Piacenza, BC: Landi 190

De Croy Bible [French]

Jena, UB: N.B. 97-98

De Thou *Bible historiale* [French]

Paris, BN: fr. 899

de Villars, Baron, *Bible historiale* [French]

Paris, BN: fr. 6-7

Delft Hours [Dutch]

Oxford, BL: Douce 248

Deubost, Katherine Gentile, Hours

Chicago, AI: 15.540

Di Bailo Pentateuch [Hebrew]

Cambridge, TC: F.18.32-33

Didier Petitpain de Bayon Hours

= Notre Dame de Pitié Hours

Nancy, BM: 34 (305)

Dóczy, Urbanus, de Nagylucse Psalter

Budapest, OSK: c.l.m.ae 369

Donato, Pietro, Bishop of Padua, Gospel-book

New York, PM: M. 180

Dresden Apocalypse

Dresden, SL: Oc. 50

Drummond Missal

New York, PM: M. 627

Duke of Sussex Catalan Bible [Hebrew]

London, BL: Add. 15250

Duke of Sussex Portuguese Pentateuch [Hebrew]

London, BL: Add. 15283

Dunes (Ter Duinen) Abbey Ritual

Bruges, GS: 77/98

Durham Psalter Commentary [French]

Durham, CL: A.II.11-13

2) Copy of vol. 2

London, BL: Royal 19.C.v

3) Copy of vol. 1

New York, PM: M. 338

Dyson Perrins Apocalypse

Malibu, JPGM: Ludwig III 1

Eberhard von Württemberg Hours

Stuttgart, WLB: Brev. 1

- Eburnant Codex: see Hornbach Sacramentary
- Edward IV Bible [French]  
London, BL: Royal 15.D.i + 18.D.ix-x
- Elizabeth de Bohun Hours and Psalter: see Astor Psalter
- Elizabeth Rejcka (Elišky Rejičky) Antiphonary  
Brno, SVK: Rajhrad 600
- Elizabeth Rejcka, Queen of Poland and Bohemia, Lectionary  
Wien, ÖNB: 1772-1773
- Elizabeth von Temritz Antiphonary  
Sankt Marienstern, KB: Fol. 6
- Elizabeth von Temritz Missal  
Sankt Marienstern, KB: Fol. 4-5
- Ellenberg Bible  
Augsburg, SSB: Cod. in fol. 57 + Ottobeuren, SB: O 13, 1-3
- Ernst MS.  
Budapest, OSK: c.l.m.ae 431
- Ernst of Pardubice Gospelbook  
Olomouc, UK: M III 2
- Escorial Small Bible [Hebrew]  
El Escorial, BSL: G.II.8
- Étienne de Poncher Pontifical  
London, BL: Egerton 1067
- Farmor Hours  
's-Gravenhage, KB: 133 D 16
- Felix V Missal  
Torino, BR: Varia 168 + Torino, AS: J.B. II-6
- Ferdinand of Aragon and Isabella of Castille Breviary  
Gotha, FB: Memb. II 24
- Ferdinand I of Aragon, King of Naples, Psalter and Prayerbook  
New York, PM: M. 541
- Ferdinand III Hours [Latin and French]  
Wien, ÖNB: 1840
- Fichet, Mamert, Calendar of: see Calendar of Mamert Fichet
- Folpard van Amerongen and Geertruy van Themseke Hours  
Malibu, JPM: Ludwig IX 7
- Frederick II of Hohenstaufen (*De arte venandi cum avibus*)  
a) Bologna, BU: 419  
b) Nantes, MD: 19  
c) Oxford, BL: Digby 152 (paraphrase)  
d) Paris, BM: 3716  
e) Rennes, BM: 227  
f) Valencia, BU: 402  
g) Vaticano, Città del, BAV: Pal. lat. 1071  
h) Wien, ÖNB: 10948  
i) Cambridge (Mass.), HU: fMS Typ 129h [French]  
j) Genève, BPU: fr. 169 [French]  
k) Paris, BN: fr. 1296 [French]  
l) Paris, BN: fr. 12400 [French]  
m) Stuttgart, WLB: HB XI 34a (fols. 99r-297v) [French]
- Frensweg MS.  
Utrecht, BR: 8.L.16
- Furtmeyr-Bibel [German]  
München, SB: Cgm 8010a
- Galszó, Stephan, Missal  
Budapest, OSK: c.l.m.ae 91
- Gegenbach Gospels  
Stuttgart, WLB: Bibl. fol. 28
- Gérard de Damville, Bishop of Cambrai, Psalter  
= Isabelle of Aragon Psalter  
= Louis, St., Psalter  
New York, PM: M. 72
- Giffard Psalter: see Vescy Psalter
- Gilbert of Stanfield Antiphonal  
Cambridge, MC: 10
- Giuliano (Julianus) della Rovere Pontifical:  
see Julius II Pontifical
- Glabach Gospels  
Darmstadt, HL: 530
- Glanfeuil Bible  
= Codex Rorigonis  
Paris, BN: lat. 3
- Glover's Roll of Arms  
a) London, BL: Add. 29796  
b) London, BL: Harley 6589
- Gobert, Nicolas, Missal  
Verdun, BM: 99



- Gonzaga, Cardinal Francesco,  
Latin Grammar  
Modena, BE: Est. lat. 1101 (α.F.2.26)
- Goulart, Simon, Bible  
Genève, BPU: lat. 3
- Greiffenceau Missal  
Baltimore, WAG: W. 174
- Guisborough Breviary  
Woolhampton, DA: 8
- Hahót Sacramentary  
Zagreb, ZN: MR 126
- Harley Catalan Bible [Hebrew]  
London, BL: Harley 1528
- Hartmut Psalter  
Sankt Gallen, SB: 19
- Holland Psalter  
Cambridge, SJC: 231 (K.26)
- Homer [Greek]  
h) Holkham  
= Pietro da Montagnana Homer  
Oxford, BL: Holkham Greek 116 (olim  
Holkham Hall 263)
- Hornbach Sacramentary  
= Eburnant Codex  
Solothurn, KKS: U.1
- Houghton *Bible historiale*: see Charles V  
*Bible historiale* 1)
- Hoya Missal  
Münster, UB: 41
- Hrotsvitha  
a) Sándor Codex [Hungarian]  
Budapest, ELTK: Hungaricus 6
- Humbert Roy de Bourg-en-Bresse *Bible  
historiale* [French]  
Paris, BN: fr. 398
- Hyde Abbey Breviary  
Oxford, BL: Rawl. liturg. e. 1\*
- Hyde Abbey Psalter  
New York, PM: G. 19
- Ibn Gaon Bibles [Hebrew]  
1) Dublin Ibn Gaon Prophets  
Dublin, TC: 16  
2) First Ibn Gaon Bible  
Paris, BN: hébr. 20
- 3) Oxford Ibn Gaon Bible  
Oxford, BL: Opp. Add. 4° 75
- 4) Parma Bible  
Parma, BP: Parm. 2938
- 5) Second Kennicott Bible  
Oxford, BL: Kennicott 2
- Infancy Gospels  
(*L'Évangile de l'Enfance*)  
a) Cambridge, UL: Gg.1.1 [Anglo-Nor-  
man]  
b) Grenoble, BM: 51 (1137) [Old  
French]  
c) Milano, BA: L 58 sup.  
d) Oxford, BL: Canon. Misc. 476  
e) Oxford, BL: Canon. Ital. 280 [Italian]  
f) Oxford, BL: Douce 237 [French]  
g) Oxford, BL: Selden Supra 38 [Anglo-  
Norman]  
h) Paris, BN: fr. 25425 (fols. 44r-50v)  
[Provençal]  
i) Philadelphia, UP: French 41 [French]
- Isabeau de Roubaix Hours  
Roubaix, BM: 6
- Isabella d'Este Canzoniere: see Songbooks  
I m)
- Isabelle de Bourbon Diurnal  
New York, PM: M. 221
- Isabelle of Aragon Psalter: see Gérard de  
Damville, Bishop of Cambrai, Psalter
- Jacqueline de Bavière Hours [French]  
Bruges, BV: 321
- Jacques du Châtelier Missal  
Paris, BA: 621
- Jacques le Lieur Hours  
Rouen, BM: 1064 (Y.226)
- Jan van Amerongen and Mary van Vronens-  
teyn Hours  
Bruxelles, BR: II.7619
- Jean II Bible [French]  
London, BL: Royal 19.D.ii
- Jean de Lannoy Missal  
Lille, BM: 32
- Jean de Montchenu Chansonnier: see Song-  
books I n)
- Jeanne de Laval Psalter  
Poitiers, BM: 41 (202)

- Jena Golden Legend  
Jena, UB: El. fol. 86 (olim 88)
- Joffroi d'A(s)premont and Isabelle de  
Quiéorain (Kievraing) Psalter  
Oxford, BL: Douce 118 + Melbourne, NG:  
Felton 171/3
- John de Brokehampton Pontifical  
Oxford, BL: Barlow 7
- John de Welles Bible [Anglo-Norman]  
Paris, BN: fr. 1
- John II of Baden Pontifical  
London, BL: Add. 39762
- Julius II Pontifical  
= Giuliano (Julianus) della Rovere Pontifi-  
cal  
Wien, ÖNB: 1819
- Kálmáncsehi Breviary  
Budapest, OSK: c.l.m.ae 446
- Kálmáncsehi Missal  
Zagreb, ZN: MR 355
- Kassa Gradual  
Budapest, OSK: c.l.m.ae 452 + 172
- Katharina van Doornik Hours  
Cambridge, FM: 137
- King's Bible [Hebrew]  
London, BL: King's 1
- Klitschdorf MS.  
= Codex Solmsianus  
Cologne-Genève, BB: Bodmer lat. 107
- Komburg Epistolary  
Stuttgart, WLB: Bibl. qu. 28
- Komburg Psalter  
Stuttgart, WLB: Bibl. fol. 46
- Kunera van Leefdael Hours  
Utrecht, BR: 5.J.26
- Lallemaut de Betz Chansonier: see Song-  
books I o)
- Lancaster-Fleming Prayer Roll: see Rolls b)
- Lannoy Hours  
Tavier, Comte Étienne d'Oultremont Col-  
lection: S.N.
- Leo X Pontifical/Ordinal/Missal  
New York, PM: H. 6
- Liber aureus Favariensis  
= Pfävers Golden Book  
Sankt Gallen, SB: Pfävers 2
- Liber Vitae  
e) Liber viventium Fabariensis  
Sankt Gallen, SB: Pfävers 1  
f) San Benedetto di Polirone  
New York, PM: M. 492 (fols. 103v-  
106r)
- Liebhart Eghenvelder Liederbuch: see  
Songbooks II j)
- Livy  
g) (Sorbonne) [French]  
Paris, BN: fr. 20071-72
- Llangattock Hours  
New York, H. P. Kraus Collection: S.N.
- Lochorst Hours  
Münster, WLMK: Inv. # 62-1
- London Catalan Bible [Hebrew]  
London, BL: Add. 15252
- London Catalan Pentateuch [Hebrew]  
London, BL: Harley 5773
- London Hebrew Grammar [Hebrew]  
London, BL: Add. 18970
- Louis de Grolée Bible [French]  
Paris, BA: 5211
- Louis, St., Psalter  
2) See Gérard de Damville, Bishop of  
Cambrai, Psalter  
3) Leiden, BR: B.P.L. 76A
- Louka Antiphonary  
Olomouc, UK: M IV 1
- Louvre *Bible historique* [French]  
Paris, BN: fr. 5707
- Lycophron [Greek]  
a) Codex Cizensis  
Zeitz, SB: 69
- Madresfield Hours  
Madresfield Court, Earl Beauchamp Col-  
lection: M
- Margaret of Austria Album: see Songbooks  
I p)
- Margaret of Austria Hours  
Wien, ÖNB: 1862
- Marguerite de Bar Breviary  
Paris, BN: lat. 1029A

- Marguerite de Willerval Hours [Latin and French]  
Bruxelles, BR: 770 (10990)
- Maria Laach Sacramentary  
Darmstadt, LH: 891
- Mariakerk Pontifical  
Utrecht, BR: 400
- Marie de Valence Breviary  
= Maria de Sancto Pol Breviary  
Cambridge, UL: Dd.5.5
- Master of Flowers (*Maitre aux fleurs*) Hours  
Paris, BA: 638
- Maurepas Chansonnier: see Songbooks I q)
- Medici Psalter  
Cambridge, FM: 37-1950
- Metz Psalter [French]  
Paris, BM: 382 (798)
- Millstatt MS.  
Klagenfurt, AGK: 6/19
- Millstatt Missal  
Klagenfurt, AGK: 6/35
- Millstatt Psalter  
Wien, ÖNB: 2682
- Modelbooks
- a) Georgius Bocskay (for King Ferdinand)  
Wien, ÖNB: Ser. n. 2664
  - b) Initials Book  
Cambridge, FM: 83-1972
  - c) Strepel, Hermannus, of Münster  
's-Gravenhage, KB: 76 D 45
  - d) Yale  
New Haven, YU: 553
  - e) Cambridge, MC: Pepys 1916
  - f) Paris, ÉBA: M 2235
- Mondsee-Wiener Liederhandschrift: see Songbooks II k)
- Montchenu, (Jean de), Chansonnier: see Songbooks I n)
- Montchenu Hours  
Clermont-Ferrand, BM: 84 (78)
- Montebourg Psalter [French]  
Oxford, BL: Douce 320
- Montfoort-Croy Hours  
[French and Flemish]  
Chicago, NL: 56
- Mozarabic Psalter  
= Santo Domingo de Silos Psalter  
London, BL: Add. 30851
- Munich Golden Legend [English]  
München, SB: Gall. 3
- Murbach Hymnal [German and Latin]  
Oxford, BL: Junius 25
- Nagylaki, Stephanus, Breviary  
Budapest, OSK: c.l.m.æ 343
- Nieuwlicht Bible [Dutch]  
Gent, BR: 632 + 's-Gravenhage, KB: 78 D 39
- Noailles Chansonnier: see Songbooks I r)
- Notre Dame de Pitié Hours: see Didier Petitpain de Bayon Hours
- Novelli, Jehan, Hours  
Genève, BPU: lat. 31
- Obendorf Psalter  
Stuttgart, WLB: Bibl. qu. 40
- Oldhall, William, and Margaret Willoughby Hours  
London, BL: Harley 2900
- Olomouc Czech Bible [Czech]  
Olomouc, UK: M III 1
- Olomouc (Olomouckihó) Missal  
Olomouc, KK: 131
- Ormulum MS. [English]  
Oxford, BL: Junius 1
- Oswald von Wolkenstein Liederhandschrift B: see Songbooks II 1)
- Oxford Catalan Pentateuch [Hebrew]  
Oxford, BL: Hunt. 69
- Pallavicino, Carlo, Marquis of Cremona, Bishop of Lodi, Kyriale/Antiphony  
New York, PM: M. 682-687
- Pannonhalma (Pannonia) Evangelistary  
Budapest, ELTK: Lat. 113
- Papeleu Bible: see Charles d'Albret *Bible historique*
- Paruta, Bartolomeo, Pontifical  
Oxford, BL: Canon. Liturg. 375
- Pauwels van Overtvelt Hours  
Bruxelles, BR: IV.95
- Peutinger, Konrad, Breviary  
Stuttgart, WLB: Brev. 91

- Pfävers Golden book: see Liber aureus Favariensis
- Phaedrus  
a) Codex Pithoeanus  
New York, PM: M. 906
- Phébus, Gaston (*Livre de la chasse*) [French]  
c) Cambridge (Mass.), HU: fMS Typ 130  
d) Genève, BPU: fr. 169  
= Louis de Bruges copy  
e) Paris, BN: fr. 616  
= Aymar de Poitiers copy
- Philip the Good Hours [Latin and French]  
Wien, ÖNB: 1800
- Philippe de Châlon *Bible historiale* [French]  
Genève, BPU: fr. 2
- Philippe de Gueldre Hours/Missal  
Pont-à-Mousson, BM: 1
- Philippe de Lévis Pontifical  
Melbourne, SLV: \*fo 96.1/R66P
- Philippe de Lévis Ritual  
Genève, BPU: lat. 37
- Philippe le Bon Prayerbook [French]  
Paris, BN: nouv. acq. fr. 16428
- Picart, Guillaume, Gradual  
Tours, BM: 208-209 [destroyed in 1940]
- Pierre Caraman (Carmain) de Nègrepelisse Breviary  
New York, PM: M. 463
- Pietro da Montagnana Homer: see Homer h)
- Pilkington Charter  
Cambridge, FM: B-L 51
- Pius V Missal  
Mondovì, AC: S.N.
- Pompadour *Bible historiale* [French]  
Berlin, DSB: Philipps 1906
- Raoul de Presles *Bible historiale* [French]  
London, BL: Landsdowne 1175
- Raoul du Fou Pontifical  
Poitiers, TCat: 1
- Redentiner Osterspiel  
Karlsruhe, BLB: Karlsruhe 369
- Remiremont Hours  
Cambridge, FM: 9-1951
- Renaud de Bar Ritual  
Metz, BM: 43 [destroyed in 1944; photographs of only a portion preserved at Metz, BM]
- Renée of Valois Prayerbook  
Modena, BE: Est. lat. 614 (α.U.2.28)
- Richard, Nicholas, Pontifical  
Cambridge, FM: 29
- Robert d'Anjou Bible  
Malines, GS: 1
- Robert de Genève Missal: see Coëtivy, Alain de, Missal
- Robert de la Marche Bible [French]  
London, BL: Royal I.A.xx
- Rolls  
a) Coverham Abbey Prayer Roll  
New York, PM: G. 39  
b) Lancaster-Fleming Prayer Roll  
New York, PM: M. 486
- Saint-Dié Gradual  
Saint-Dié, BM: 74  
— Mary Overy (Southwark) Hours  
London, BL: Add. 62105  
— Mihiel Gradual  
Saint-Mihiel, BM: 73  
— Pierre de Genève Gospels  
Genève, BPU: lat. 38 b  
— Sépulcre of Cambrai Breviary  
Cambrai, BM: 102 (102)
- Sainte-Vanne Missal  
Verdun, BM: 96  
— Aure Gospels  
Paris, BA: 1171  
— Élizabéth de Roubaix Hours  
Roubaix, BM: 8
- San Benedetto di Polirone Liber Vitae: see Liber Vitae f)  
— Rufos Missal  
Tortosa, AC: 11  
— Silvestro in Foligno Missal  
New York, PM: M. 379
- Sándor Codex: see Hrotsvitha a)
- Sanford Bible [French]  
London, BL: Add. 40619-40620
- Sankt Paul Sacramentary  
Sankt Paul im Lavanttal, SB: 20/1 (XXIX,2.2)

Santo Domingo de Silos Psalter:  
see Mozarabic Psalter

Scheibler'sches Wappenbuch

München, SB: Cod. icon. 312c

Scher(e)nberg Psalter

Karlsruhe, BLB: St. Peter Perg. 139 (olim  
Donaueschingen, Fürstlich Fürstenber-  
gische Hofbibliothek 185)

Sedulius Scottus Psalter [Latin and Greek]

Paris, BA: 8407 (gr. 2)

Seilern Hours

(heirs of Count Antoine Seilern, present  
location unknown; recently kept at Lon-  
don, University of London, Courtauld In-  
stitute of Art where a complete set of photo-  
graphs are available for consultation in the  
Conway Photographic Collection)

Seligenstadt Gospels

Darmstadt, LH: 1957

Seneca

b) Codex Basini

= Codex Cruserianus

Vaticano, Città del, BAV: Reg. lat.  
1681

c) Codex Melisseus

Oxford, BL: Holkham 390

d) Mostyn Hall Seneca

Bloomington (Ind.), IU: Lat. 1400

Senones Gospels

Paris, BN: lat. 9392

Serugiel Bible [Hebrew]

Oxford, BL: Arch. Selden A. 47

Sforza, Francesco Maria, Hours

- Il Duchetto Hours

London, BL: Add. 63493

Simonds d'Ewes Bible [French]

London, BL: Harley 616 + Yates Thomp-  
son 9 (= Add. 41751)

Songbooks

I Chansonnier

1) Clairambault

Paris, BN: fr. 12686-12743

m) Isabella d'Este Canzoniere

Roma, BCas: 2856

n) Jean de Montchenu

Paris, BN: Rothschild 2973

o) Lallemant de Betz

Paris, BN: fr. 12660-12665

p) Margaret of Austria Album  
Bruxelles, BR: 228

q) Maurepas

Paris, BN: fr. 12616-12659

r) Noailles

Paris, BN: fr. 12615

II Liederbuch

j) Liebhard Eghenvelder

Wien, ÖNB: Ser. n. 3344

k) Mondsee-Wiener

= Spoerl

Wien, ÖNB: 2856

l) Oswald von Wolkenstein Liederhand-  
schrift B

Innsbruck, UB: S.N.

m) Weingarten Liederhandschrift

Stuttgart, WLB: HB XIII 1 (olim  
Weingarten K 107)

Spinola Hours

Malibu, JPM: Ludwig IX 18

Stefan the Great Gospels [Bulgarian]

München, SB: Slav. 1

Stuart, Mary, Hours

Paris, BN: lat. 1405

Surtees Psalter (English Prose Psalter)

1) London, BL: Add. 17376

2) Dublin, TC: 69 (A.4.4) (fols. 1r-55v)  
(olim H.32)

Sydney Hours

Sydney, SLNSW: S.N.

Szelepchényi Evangelistary

Nitra, KK: 118

Thomas du Val (of Clairefontaine) Bible  
[French]

London, BL: Royal 19.D.iii

Umfray, John and Eleanor, Hours

London, BL: Sloane 2468

Van Alfen Hours

Baltimore, WAG: W. 782

Várdy, Franciscus, Bishop of Transylvania,  
Pontifical

Wien, ÖNB: 1799\*

- Vasselin Family Hours  
London, BL: Harley 2969
- Vesey Psalter  
= Clare Psalter  
= Giffard Psalter  
New York, PM: M. 100
- Vianden Hours  
Chicago, UC: 344
- Vitéz, Johannes, Pontifical  
Vaticano, Città del, BAV: Ottob. lat. 501
- Vocabularius Sancti Galli  
Sankt Gallen, SB: 913
- Volto Santo di Lucca Legend  
Vaticano, Città del, BAV: Pal. lat. 1988
- Waldburg Breviary  
Stuttgart, WLB: Brev. 12
- Weingarten Liederhandschrift: see Song-books II m)
- West-Saxon Gospels [Anglo-Saxon]  
a) Cambridge, UL: li.2.11
- b) London, BL: Royal 1.A.xiv  
c) Oxford, BL: Hatton 38
- Willem von Montfort Hours  
Wien, ÖNB: Ser. n. 12878
- Windberg Legendary  
München, SB: Clm 22240-22245 (olim Windberg 40-45)
- Wolfgang Missal  
Rein/Reun, SB: 206
- Wulfstan Homilies  
- Homiliarium Sancti Wulfstani  
Oxford, BL: Hatton 113-114
- Zábrdovice Gospelbook  
Olomouc, UK: M II 74
- Zagreb Bible  
Zagreb, NSB: MR 156
- Zwettl Bärenhaut  
Zwettl, SB: Archivum 2/1

## INDEX OF MANUSCRIPTS

- AACHEN, Peter Ludwig Collection: see MALIBU, J. Paul Getty Museum
- AUGSBURG, Staats- und Stadtbibliothek (SSB)  
Cod. in fol. 57: 337a
- BALTIMORE, Walters Art Gallery (WAG)  
W. 105: 335a  
174: 338a  
782: 342b
- BERLIN, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek (DSB)  
Phillipps 1906: 341a
- BLOOMINGTON (Ind.), Indiana University, Lilly Library (IU)  
Lat. 1400: 342a
- BOLOGNA, Biblioteca Universitaria (BU)  
419: 337b
- BRNO, Státní vědecká knihovna (Universitní knihovna) (SVK)  
Rajhrad 600: 337a
- BRUGES, Bibliothèque de la Ville (BV)  
321: 338b
- , Grand Séminaire (GS)  
77/98: 336b
- BRUXELLES, Bibliothèque Royale (BR)  
61 (II.175): 336a  
770 (10990): 340a  
3179 (7672-4): 336a  
228: 342b  
II.7619: 338b  
IV.95: 340b
- BUDAPEST, Eötvös Lóránd Tudományegyetem Könyvtár (Eötvös Lóránd University Library) (ELTK)  
Hungaricus 6: 338a  
Lat. 113: 340b
- , Országos Széchényi Könyvtár (National Museum Library) (OSK)  
c.l.m.ae 91: 337b  
172: 339a  
343: 340b  
369: 336b  
404: 335b  
431: 337a  
433: 334a  
446: 339a  
452: 339a



- KARLSRUHE, Badische Landesbibliothek (BLB)  
 Karlsruhe 369: 341a  
 St. Peter Perg. 139: 342a
- KLAGENFURT, Archiv des Geschichtsverein für  
 Kärnten (AGK)  
 6/19: 340a  
 6/35: 340a
- LEIDEN, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit (BR)  
 B.P.L. 76A: 339b
- LILLE, Bibliothèque Municipale (BM)  
 32: 338b
- LONDON, British Library (BL)  
 Add. 15250: 336b  
 15252: 339b  
 15283: 336b  
 16997: 335b  
 17167: 334b  
 17376: 342b  
 18751: 336a  
 18970: 339b  
 29796: 337b  
 30851: 340a  
 39758: 335b  
 39762: 339a  
 40619-40620: 341b  
 41751: 342a  
 62105: 341b  
 63493: 342a  
 Egerton 1067: 337a  
 Harley 273: 336a  
 616: 342a  
 1528: 338a  
 2900: 340b  
 2969: 343a  
 3601: 335a  
 5773: 339b  
 6589: 337b  
 King's 1: 339a  
 Lansdowne 1175: 341a  
 Royal 1.A.xiv: 343b  
 1.A.xx: 341b  
 1.E.vi: 335a  
 15.D.i: 337a  
 18.D.ix-x: 337a  
 19.C.v: 336b  
 19.D.ii: 338b  
 19.D.iii: 342b  
 Sloane 2468: 342b  
 Yates Thompson 9 (= Add. 41751): 342a  
 —, University of London, Courtauld Institute of Art  
 Seilern Hours: 342a
- MADRESFIELD COURT (Worcestershire), Earl  
 Beauchamp Collection  
 M: 339b
- MADRID, Biblioteca Nacional (BN)  
 10069: 335b  
 Vitr. 24.1: 335b
- MALIBU, J. Paul Getty Museum (JPGM)  
 Ludwig III 1: 336b  
 V 1: 335a  
 IX 7: 337a  
 IX 18: 342b
- MALINES, Grand Séminaire (GS) [Mss. preserved at Leuven, Katholieke Universiteit, Bibliotheek Faculteiten]  
 1: 341b
- MANCHESTER, John Rylands Library of the University of Manchester (JR)  
 Lat. 142: 335a
- MELBOURNE, National Gallery (NG)  
 Felton 171/3: 339b  
 —, State Library of Victoria (SLV)  
 \*fo 96.1/R66P: 341a
- MELK, Stiftsbibliothek (SB)  
 1845 (olim 1860): 335a
- METZ, Bibliothèque Municipale (BM)  
 43 [destroyed 1944]: 341b
- MILANO, Biblioteca Ambrosiana  
 L 58 sup.: 338b
- MODENA, Biblioteca Estense e Universitaria (BE)  
 Est. lat. 614 (α.U.2.28): 341b  
 1101 (α.F.2.26): 338a
- MONDOVI, Archivio Capitolare (AC)  
 S.N.: 341a
- MÜNCHEN, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek (BS)  
 Cgm 8010a: 337b  
 Cim 44 (Cim. 5): 336a  
 22240-22245: 343b  
 Cod. icon. 312c: 342a  
 Gall. 3: 340b  
 Mus. 3725: 335a  
 Slav. 1: 342b
- MÜNSTER, Universitätsbibliothek (UB)  
 41: 338a  
 —, Westfälisches Landesmuseum für Kunst- und Kulturgeschichte (WLMK)  
 Inv. # 62-1: 339b
- NANCY, Bibliothèque Municipale (BM)  
 34 (305): 336b
- NANTES, Musée Dobrée (MD)  
 19: 337b



- NEW HAVEN, Yale University, Beinecke Library (YU)  
553: 340a
- NEW YORK, H. P. Kraus Collection  
S.N.: 339b
- , The Pierpont Morgan Library (PM)  
G. 19: 338a  
39: 341b  
H. 6: 339a  
M. 72: 337b  
100: 343a  
180: 336b  
221: 338b  
241: 335a  
338: 336b  
379: 341b  
463: 341a  
486: 341b  
492 (fols. 103v-106r): 339b  
541: 337a  
627: 336b  
682-687: 340b  
897: 335b  
906: 341a
- NITRA, Kapitulní knihovna (KK)  
118: 342b
- OLOMOUČ, Kapitulní knihovna (KK)  
131: 340b
- , Státní vědecká knihovna, Universitní knihovna (olím Univerzita palackého) (UK)  
M II 74: 343b  
M III 1: 340b  
M III 2: 337a  
M III 3: 335a  
M IV 1: 339b
- OTTOBEUREN, Stiftsbibliothek (SB)  
O 13, 1-3: 337a
- OXFORD, Bodleian Library (BL)  
Barlow 7: 339a  
Canon. Ital. 280: 338b  
Canon. Liturg. 375: 340b  
Canon. Misc. 476: 338b  
Canon. Or. 77: 335a  
Digby 152: 337b  
Douce 118: 339a  
237: 338b  
248: 336b  
320: 340a  
Hatton 38: 343b  
113-114: 343b  
Holkham 390: 342a  
Holkham Greek 116: 338a
- Hunt. 69: 340b  
Junius 1: 340b  
25: 340b  
Kennicott 2: 338b  
Opp. Add. 4° 26: 334a  
75: 338b  
Rawl. B. 505: 336a  
Rawl. liturg. e. 1\*: 338a  
Arch. Selden A. 47: 342a  
Selden Supra 38: 338b
- PARIS, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal (BA)  
590: 335b  
621: 338a  
638: 340a  
1117: 341b  
5059: 335b  
5211: 339b  
5212: 335b  
8407 (gr. 2): 342a
- , Bibliothèque Mazarine (BM)  
312: 336a  
382: 340a  
3716: 337b
- , Bibliothèque Nationale (BN)  
esp. 30: 335b  
fr. 1: 339a  
6-7: 336b  
152: 335b  
398: 338a  
616: 341a  
790: 334a  
899: 336b  
1296: 337b  
1590: 334a  
5707: 339b  
12400: 337b  
12615: 342b  
12616-12659: 342b  
12660-12665: 342a  
12686-12743: 342a  
18648 (fols. 32r-39v): 335a  
20071-20072: 339b  
25425 (fols. 44r-50v): 338b  
hébr. 20: 338a  
lat. 3: 337b  
848: 336a  
1029A: 339b  
1405: 342b  
9392: 342a  
nouv. acq. fr. 16428: 341a  
nouv. acq. lat. 2288-2289: 334a  
3102: 335a

- 3120: 334b  
3179: 335a  
Rothschild 2973: 342a  
—, École des Beaux Arts (ÉBA)  
M 2235: 340a  
PARMA, Biblioteca Palatina (BP)  
Parm. 2938: 338b  
PHILADELPHIA, University of Pennsylvania, Van  
Pelt Library (UP)  
French 41: 338b  
PIACENZA, Biblioteca Comunale (BC)  
Comunale S.N.: 334b, 336a  
Landi 190: 336b  
POITIERS, Bibliothèque Municipale (BM)  
41 (202): 338b  
—, Trésor de la Cathédrale (TCat)  
1: 341a  
PONT-A-MOUSSON, Bibliothèque Municipale  
(BM)  
1: 341a  
PRAHA, Památník národního písemnictví na  
Strahove (Strahovska knihovna) (PNPS)  
DG 1 19: 334a  
—, Státní knihovna ČSR (Universitní kni-  
hovna) (SK)  
XIV C 3: 335b  
REIMS, Bibliothèque Municipale (BM)  
250 (C. 158): 335a  
REIN/REUN, Stiftsbibliothek (SB)  
206: 343b  
RENNES, Bibliothèque Municipale (BM)  
227: 337b  
ROMA, Biblioteca Casanatense (BCas)  
2856: 342a  
ROUBAIX, Bibliothèque Municipale (BM)  
6: 338b  
8: 341b  
ROUEN, Bibliothèque Municipale (BM)  
1064 (Y.226): 338b  
SAINT-DIÉ, Bibliothèque Municipale (BM)  
74: 341b  
—, MHIÉL, Bibliothèque Municipale (BM)  
73: 341b  
SANKT GALLEN, Stiftsbibliothek (SB)  
19: 338a  
913: 343a  
Pfävers 1: 339b  
2: 339b  
—, MARIENSTERN, Klosterbibliothek (KB)  
Fol. 4-5: 337a  
6: 337a  
—, PAUL IM LAVANTTAL, Stiftsbibliothek (SB)  
20/1 (XXIX,2.2): 341b  
SOLOTHURN, Kathedrale Kirchenschatz (KKS)  
U.1: 338a  
STOCKHOLM, Nationalmuseum (NM)  
B 1726-27: 335a  
STUTTGART, Württembergische Landesbibliothek  
(WLB)  
Bibl. fol. 28: 337b  
46: 339a  
Bibl. qu. 28: 339a  
40: 340b  
71: 334b  
Brev. 1: 336b  
12: 343a  
91: 340b  
HB I 175: 334b  
XI 34a (fols. 99r-297v): 337b  
XIII 1: 342b  
SYDNEY, State Library of New South Wales  
(SLNSW)  
S.N.: 342b  
—, Sydney University Library (SU)  
S.N.: 335a  
TAVIER, Comte Étienne d'Oultremont Collection  
S.N.: 339a  
TORINO, Archivio di Stato (AS)  
J.B. II-6: 337a  
—, Biblioteca Reale (BR)  
Varia 168: 337a  
TORTOSA, Archivo Capitular (AC)  
11: 341b  
TOURS, Bibliothèque Municipale (BM)  
208-209: 341a  
221: 335a  
UTRECHT, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit (BR)  
400: 340a  
5.J.26: 339a  
8.L.16: 337b  
8.L.20: 336a  
VALENCIA, Biblioteca Universitaria (BU)  
402: 337b  
VATICANO, CITTÀ DEL, Biblioteca Apostolica  
Vaticana (BAV)  
Barb. lat. 562: 335a  
Ottob. lat. 501: 343a  
Pal. lat. 1071: 337b  
1988: 343a  
Reg. lat. 1681: 342a

## VERDUN, Bibliothèque Municipale (BM)

96: 341b

99: 341b

## VESOUL, Bibliothèque Municipale (BM)

27: 335b

## WIEN, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek (ÖNB)

1772-1773: 337a

1799\*: 342b

1800: 341a

1819: 339a

1840: 337a

1862: 339b

2682: 340a

2856: 342b

3336: 334b

10948: 337b

Ser. n. 2664: 340a

2762: 335a

3344: 342b

12878: 343b

## WOOLHAMPTON, Douai Abbey (DA)

8: 338a

## ZAGREB, Zagrebačka Nadbiskupija (Biblioteca Metropolitana) (ZN) (mss. kept in Nacionalna i Sveučilišna Biblioteka)

MR 126: 338a

156: 343b

355: 339a

## ZEITZ, Stiftsbibliothek (SB)

69: 339b

## ZWETTL, Stiftsbibliothek (SB)

Archivum 2/1: 343b

OLEG SVYATOSLAVICH AND HIS PATRONAGE  
OF  
THE CULT OF SS. BORIS AND GLEB\*

*Martin Dimnik, C.S.B.*

OLEG, the son of Svyatoslav Yaroslavich of Chernigov, was one of the most important princes in Rus' during the last quarter of the eleventh and the beginning of the twelfth century. After Svyatoslav's premature death, in 1076, his five sons, the Svyatoslavichi, were deprived of Chernigov and its lands, namely, the most important part of Svyatoslav's patrimony. Oleg, the second youngest son, became the most energetic defender of his family's inheritance; he took up arms against the other princes of Rus' for two short periods of time. The first began in 1078 and ended soon after with his exile to Byzantium; the second began in 1094 and lasted until the princes of Rus' reached a settlement at the congress of Lyubech. Unfortunately for Oleg, he had to solicit aid from the nomadic Polovtsy and for this many of his contemporaries condemned him. Perhaps the most damning criticism came from the unknown author of the epic poem *Slovo o polku Igoreve*:

And there were the campaigns of Oleg,  
Oleg, son of Sviatoslav.  
That Oleg fostered feuds with his sword  
and sowed the Russian lands with arrows.  
In the city of Tmutorokan  
he used to put his foot in the golden stirrup...  
Then, in the era of Oleg,  
son of misfortune [*Goreslavich*],  
the feuding spread and grew.  
The fortune of god Dazhbog's grandson was destroyed.  
Human lives became shortened through the prince's discord.<sup>1</sup>

\* Research for this article was partially supported by a research grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, which I gratefully acknowledge. My sincere thanks also to J. L. I. Fennell, P. Hollingsworth and, especially, V. I. Mezentsev for their helpful criticism.

<sup>1</sup> The translation is from S. A. Zenkovsky, ed., *Medieval Russia's Epics, Chronicles, and Tales*, revised and enlarged edition (New York, 1974), p. 175 ('...byli pitsi Oigovy, Ol'ga Svyat'slavlichya. Ty bo Oleg mechem kramolu kovashe i strely po zemli seyashe. Stupaet v zlat stremen' v grade T'mutorokane...Togda pri Olze Gorislavichi seyashetsya i rastyashet' usobitsami, pogibashet' zhizn' Dazhd'bozha vnuka, v knyazhikh kramolakh vetsi chelovekom' skratishas'.') [*A Historical Russian Reader*, ed. by J. Fennell and D. Obolensky (Oxford, 1969), pp. 65-66].

THE BEGINNINGS OF ENGLISH ADMINISTRATION  
IN PONTIEU:  
AN UNNOTICED DOCUMENT OF 1280

*John Carmi Parsons*

THE accession of Edward I of England and his consort Eleanor of Castile to the small Picard county of Ponthieu, upon the death of Eleanor's mother Jeanne de Dammartin in March 1279, presented the English couple with a demanding political and administrative challenge. The new count and countess were foreign monarchs not resident in Ponthieu, a fact that posed problems enough to the supervision of business in the county; but their new situation involved much more than merely establishing possession of Eleanor's inheritance and consolidating their control over it, for any actions Edward and Eleanor might take with regard to Ponthieu would inevitably be played out in the context of a new and potentially delicate relationship with the French Crown. As duke of Aquitaine, Edward I was already a vassal of the king of France, but the Plantagenet claim to Aquitaine had been formally recognized by the Treaty of Paris in 1259, and in any event Edward's rights there derived from the marriage of Henry II and Eleanor of Aquitaine more than a century earlier. The French king was a far more redoubtable presence in 1279 than he had been in 1152, as King John's grandson had every reason to know, and in the last quarter of the thirteenth century the fresh establishment of English authority in a corner of northwest France would require caution and close attention to detail.

Modern scholars have made good use of the wealth of material, both published and unpublished, that survives to illustrate the beginnings of English administration in Ponthieu.<sup>1</sup> In the nineteenth century Ernest Prarond, a dedicated native

<sup>1</sup> Of published sources, an indispensable starting point is C. Brunel, *Recueil des actes des comtes de Pontieu (1026-1279)* (Paris, 1930). F. Michel and C. Bémont, eds., *Rôles gascons (1242-1307)*, 4 vols. (Paris, 1896-1906) [hereafter *RG*], contain as an appendix to vol. 3 the enrolled acts of Edward I relative to Ponthieu. A. Beugnet, F. Bourquelot and C. Louandre, eds., *Les Olim ou registres des arrêts rendus par la cour du roi sous les règnes de saint Louis, de Philippe le Hardi, de Philippe le Bel, de Louis le Hutin et de Philippe le Long*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1839-48), are the records of the Paris *Parlement*. The destruction of local archives in Ponthieu in 1940 is to some small extent offset by calendars and texts in two works: A. Ledieu, *Catalogue analytique des manuscrits de la bibliothèque d'Abbeville* (Abbeville, 1886), and A. Thierry, *Recueil des monuments inédits de l'histoire*

Ponthevin, achieved a prodigious output of editions and monographs dealing with the county's history, a body of work whose value has increased through the destruction of many of the local archives Prarond used.<sup>2</sup> Drawing on Prarond's work and adding some unpublished material from the Public Record Office, the English scholar Hilda Johnstone produced in 1914 a useful sketch of Ponthevin administration under Edward I,<sup>3</sup> expanded by E. G. Shealy, Jr.'s unpublished 1977 doctoral thesis.<sup>4</sup> The earliest stages of administrative assimilation in Ponthieu under Edward I and Queen Eleanor are readily illustrated by enrolments, chiefly from the Gascon Rolls but also from a few entries on the calendared Patent and Close Rolls. While this material provides a valuable framework, it is quite difficult to put flesh on the bones, although some letters in the Ancient Correspondence can be of help in pinning down the inevitable clashes in temperament and outlook that were created as English and Ponthevins came into contact.

In a wholly unexpected location among the records in the Public Record Office, however, there has survived a unique administrative document almost entirely overlooked,<sup>5</sup> which affords a more detailed picture of the operations of the

*du tiers État*, 4 vols. (Paris, 1850-70), especially vol. 4. In addition to the edited cartulary discussed in the following note, there is G. de Lhomel, ed., *Le cartulaire de la ville de Montreuil-sur-Mer* (Abbeville, 1904). Edited English sources are principally (in addition to the *RG* cited above) the extensive series of calendared rolls from the Public Record Office [P.R.O.], London, although a few isolated texts are in T. Rymer, ed., *Foedera, conventiones, litterae* ..., 4 vols. in 7 (London, 1816-69).

Principal unpublished sources used here are, in France, Paris, Archives Nationales [AN] J 235-37 (private charters), Bibliothèque Nationale [BN] lat. 10112 (discussed in following note), and a few transcripts in the collection of Dom Grenier. In England, all manuscripts cited are from London, P.R.O., chiefly from the Ancient Correspondence (S.C. 1/), Chancery Miscellany (C 47/), and Exchequer Accounts, Various (E 101/), although the document edited here is from the Chancery *Liberate* rolls (C 62/57, schedule to m. 8).

<sup>2</sup> E. Prarond, *Histoire d'Abbeville. Abbeville avant la guerre de cent ans* (Abbeville, 1891), is his most substantial monograph. His edition of Paris, BN lat. 10112, the so-called 'Livre Rouge d'Abbeville', titled *Le cartulaire du comté de Ponthieu* (Abbeville, 1897), is useful principally as a guide to the original manuscript. Only comital charters are given *in extenso*, and it is a good idea to compare Prarond's texts for such documents with those in Brunel's *Recueil*. In some cases the documents are not well presented even when given in extended form, e.g., the grant of 4 November 1279, at pp. 289-90, where the witness list is lacking although it appears in lat. 10112, fol. 341v (P.R.O. S.C. 1/12/165 is the draft of a French text for the same grant). Prarond's abridgements and calendars of non-comital instruments in the cartulary are frequently too brief to be of much use, as for example the fragment at p. 291, which breaks off with the explanation 'La lettre est assez longue'. For the sake of accuracy, then, both Paris, BN lat. 10112 and the edition will be cited here.

<sup>3</sup> H. Johnstone, 'The County of Ponthieu, 1279-1307', *English Historical Review* [EHR] 29 (1914) 435-52.

<sup>4</sup> E. H. Shealy, Jr., *The English Administration of Ponthieu, 1279-1369* (Diss. Emory, 1977). See also R. T. McDonald, *The Countship of Ponthieu to 1100* (Diss. Bryn Mawr, 1971) and S. B. Storey-Challenger, *L'administration anglaise du Ponthieu après le traité de Brétigny, 1361-1369*, trans. R. Petit (Abbeville, 1975).

<sup>5</sup> L. F. Salzman, *Edward I* (London, 1968), pp. 99-100, does not cite the document but is unquestionably drawing from it in mentioning the apple cuttings (13) and the Isembart romance (17). Boldface arabic numerals refer to the entries of the text as numbered in the edition below.

administrators in Ponthieu during the first eighteen months of English dominion there. While it is best to follow the lead of a contemporary clerk and describe the document as a schedule attached to the eighth membrane of the Chancery *Liberate* roll for 9 Edward I (20 November 1280-19 November 1281),<sup>6</sup> it is in fact a membrane of almost the same size as those that make up the roll itself. Careful ruling and immaculately neat writing show that the schedule was attentively prepared for some specific and important purpose. The document is written entirely in French (not Anglo-Norman), with considerable latitude in orthography; there are a few isolated jottings in a different hand on the dorse.

The date of the document, and its function, are provided by two enrolled writs of Edward I, one on the Patent Roll for the ninth year of the reign and the other on the Chancery *Liberate* Roll for the tenth year (1281-82). The former, dated 9 December 1280, is the king's commission to John de Lovetot and Giles de Audenarde to audit the accounts of the receiver of Ponthieu, the bailiffs and other officials there, for all the time the county had been in the king's hands.<sup>7</sup> The *Liberate* Roll for 10 Edward I bears a writ of 15 December 1281 ordering allocation in the receiver's accounts of the expenses found on the present schedule connected with the knighting of Hugh de Famechon (40-43), the alms given by the king to the Franciscans of Abbeville (50), the expenses of Henry de Grandison (57), and whatever amounts had been spent by the receiver in accordance with letters from the queen (1-49).<sup>8</sup> The commission of 9 December 1280 to Lovetot and Audenarde includes an explicit order to review the seneschal's expenses on matters pertaining to his office, a stipulation patently related to the last item on the schedule begging reconsideration of the seneschal's small wage (76).<sup>9</sup> This suggests that the planned audit had been in preparation for some time, and that the schedule was perhaps already in England and its contents known before the commission of 9 December issued. Obviously the audit was a time-consuming affair, or else there were some disagreements over its results, for although the schedule claims that the receiver had consulted with the king, who had ordered allowance for the expenses of Famechon's knighting (43), a writ for allocation of those and other expenses did not issue for another year, until December 1281.

Only one of the entries on the schedule has anything like an exact date; this, and the few additional entries for which approximate dates can be suggested, relate the

<sup>6</sup> London, P.R.O. C 62/57, m. 8, has a marginal notation referring to the document: 'Respicie cedulam pendentem de allocacionibus faciendis in Pontiuo'.

<sup>7</sup> CPR 1272-1281, p. 419.

<sup>8</sup> London, P.R.O. C 62/58, m. 4.

<sup>9</sup> The seneschal's wages were at first 200 *li.* of Paris, but at some point before June 1285 this was increased to 300 *li.* (RG 3.5028, 5072). It is tempting to think this might have resulted from the request on the present schedule, but nothing can be proved.

schedule to business in the year 1280. The statement (37) that Otho de Grandison and John de Vescy were in Ponthieu to deal with the county's debts on the Thursday before Easter 'in the year 79' must surely refer to A.D. 1280 (N. S.), since the custom in France was to reckon the beginning of the year of grace at Easter. A.D. 1279 in France therefore ended on 1 April, so that if the English envoys had been in Ponthieu on Maundy Thursday 1279 (N. S.) the actual date would have been 30 March 1279, barely two weeks after the queen's mother died. While the debts left by Jeanne and her second husband were to cause her successors no small amount of trouble, it does seem unlikely that the king and queen would have sent such prominent envoys on the business at so early a date, especially since their first agreement concerning the debts was not concluded with the queen's stepfather, John de Falvy, until 13 July 1279.<sup>10</sup> But if the French system of dating is taken into account, the date of the envoys' presence in Ponthieu was 18 April 1280, which fits reasonably well with the apparent sequence of events surrounding the debts.<sup>11</sup> The other entries for which tentative dates may be suggested can be dealt with more quickly. Geoffrey de Geneville and his wife (13) were preparing to leave England for an extended stay abroad in February 1280. Hugh de Famechon (40-43) seems to have been knighted around August 1280, when he was granted a yearly money fee. The ceremony of knighthood was performed by John de Grailly (40, 74), who was sent to Paris on a diplomatic mission in July 1280 and could have presided at such an event in Ponthieu either on his initial journey or his return. Guillot du Vergier was unquestionably sent to the count of Flanders in August 1280 (3, 56). Finally, it is possible that Henry de Grandison and the younger Francesco Accursi were travelling to Paris on the business of John de Ponthieu shortly before the Pentecost *Parlement* in 1280 (57).

The majority of entries on the schedule, however, cannot be so readily assigned a chronological order, and the only firm limits for the business it records must be Eleanor's accession in March 1279 and the commission for audit of 9 December 1280, as is plainly implied by the commission's statement that the audit was to take in the whole period Ponthieu had been in Edward's hands. The schedule thus deals with a period of about eighteen months ending in December 1280, since it may safely be assumed that the schedule contains no business earlier than Eleanor's return to England in June 1279 from her first visit to Ponthieu as its countess.

That the schedule was produced for what was obviously the first English examination of finances in Ponthieu offers an explanation for the anomalous present location of the document, and its fortuitous preservation. It was natural for the king and queen to wish to keep a close eye on the first audit, to satisfy

<sup>10</sup> *RG* 3.5019.

<sup>11</sup> See below, pp. 391-94.



themselves thoroughly as to the efficiency of their administrators. Thus, while the English Chancery was already carrying Ponthevin business on the Gascon Rolls, the audit was carried out in England,<sup>12</sup> the writs of commission enrolled on Chancery records concerning English finance, and the documents related to the audit kept there. The audit was performed by two administrators whose duties kept them close to the king and queen: Giles de Audenarde, sometime keeper of Henry III's wardrobe and by 1279 clerk of the king's Great Wardrobe,<sup>13</sup> and John de Lovetot, royal justice and auditor of the accounts of the queen's manorial officials in England.<sup>14</sup> Once the initial audit was completed, and the king and queen assured that business in Ponthieu had settled into a stable routine, there was no reason not to transfer future commissions for Ponthevin audits to their logical place on the Gascon Rolls, and with a single stray exception in 1285 such commissions disappear from the Patent and *Liberate* Rolls.<sup>15</sup> The result, unfortunately, is that no other schedules of expenses have been preserved, so that the December 1280 schedule offers a unique glimpse inside the administration of Ponthieu. An analysis of its contents, edited below, provides further insights into the particular problems the English king and queen faced in Ponthieu, and into the methods adopted to deal with them.

The entries on the schedule are helpfully divided by the scribe into three distinct groups. The first group (1-49) involves disbursements by the receiver of Ponthieu as ordered by letters of credit from the queen in England; the second (50-68) consists of other administrative expenses, mostly but not exclusively for messengers and envoys, including the seneschal's trip to England to consult with the king. The third group (71-75) is made up of amounts spent by the seneschal, apparently without instruction or approval from England, in providing for important visitors

<sup>12</sup> It is unlikely that documents connected with the audit would have been sent to England had this not been the case. In 1290, all documents touching accounts in Ponthieu were kept there (*RG* 3.5104). The writ of December 1281 proves that the sums in which the schedule is noted are in sterling, which further suggests that it was prepared for an audit to be conducted in England.

<sup>13</sup> T. F. Tout, *Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England. The Wardrobe, the Chamber and the Small Seals*, 6 vols. (Manchester, 1920-33), 6, index p. 350 s.v. 'Oudenarde, Giles of'. Although Giles clearly came from Oudenarde, the contemporary spelling is used here.

<sup>14</sup> Lovetot appears as the queen's auditor in four rolls of proceedings from inquests held after her death into her officials' behavior (P.R.O. Justices Itinerant, J.I. 1/542, 837, 1014, 1149). His misconduct seems to have been widely known; a selection of the facts can be seen in Johnstone, 'The Queen's Household' in Tout, *ibid.* 5.271. Lovetot was disgraced during the judicial scandals of 1289-93; T. F. Tout and H. Johnstone, *State Trials of the Reign of Edward I, 1289-93* (Camden Society, 3rd Ser., 9; London, 1906), pp. 236-39. Though he was pardoned in February 1291 (*CPR* 1281-1292, p. 421), a cancelled entry in the queen's treasury accounts for Michaelmas term 1289 suggests that she dismissed him upon his disgrace (P.R.O. Ministers' Accounts, S.C. 6/1089/25, m. 4).

<sup>15</sup> P.R.O. C 62/61, m. 4, identical to *RG* 3.5072 (6 June 1285).

to Ponthieu and in replacing a horse lost on the king's service. The jottings on the back of the schedule appear to relate to specific items on the front, and were probably added during the audit.

The schedule is the only extant source illustrating the contents of those letters of credit sent to Ponthieu by the queen, mentioned in almost every one of the later commissions for audit.<sup>16</sup> As may be expected, this group of expenses offers much that is of purely personal interest concerning Eleanor herself, the sort of thing witnessed on a larger scale by the English wardrobe accounts: her passion for fresh fruit and cheeses (5, 13, 46, 63), her attention to the gardens at her residences (13), and her fondness for pet birds (8). Her literary interests are indicated by the purchase of twelve silver ornaments for her books (3), and by a romance about Isembart written, illuminated and bound for her at a cost of £ 2:17:5 (17-18).<sup>17</sup> This work does not seem to have survived, but the reference to it is not without interest because of the close connection between the literary personage of Isembart and the county of Ponthieu, where the legends that have given rise to the original *geste* of *Gormond et Isembart* are known to have been centered, deriving specifically from the battle of Saucourt in Vimeu, in 881. In the original *geste* Isembart was merely a French nobleman who revolted against his king, but by the thirteenth century French chroniclers had transformed him into a count or duke of Ponthieu, the lord of a vast domain around Amiens.<sup>18</sup> It would seem that Eleanor had come to regard him as one of her Ponthevin ancestors or predecessors, and her sponsorship of a new literary work about him so soon after she herself inherited the county suggests that Eleanor's individual acts of literary patronage were not unrelated to events in her life, as, for example, the translation of Vegetius' *De re militari* she caused to be made as a gift for her husband while they were on crusade in Palestine, in 1271-72.<sup>19</sup>

Letters of credit issued by the queen against the revenues of Ponthieu raise the question of the role those revenues played in her financial system. Eleanor's

<sup>16</sup> RG 3.5059 (13 November 1283), 5072 (6 June 1285), 5078 (15 October 1285), 5090 (3 June 1290).

<sup>17</sup> For further discussion see J. C. Parsons, *The Court and Household of Eleanor of Castile in 1290* (Toronto, 1977), especially pp. 11-14.

<sup>18</sup> A. Pauphilet, 'Sur la Chanson d'Isembart', *Romania* 50 (1924) 161-94; J. Bédier, *Les légendes épiques: recherches sur la formation des chansons de geste*, 3rd edition, 4 vols. (Paris, 1929), 4.21-91; W. C. Calin, *The Old French Epic of Revolt: Raoul de Cambrai, Renaud de Montauban, Gormond et Isembard* (Paris-Geneva, 1962), pp. 48-53.

<sup>19</sup> L. Thorpe, 'Mastre Richard, a Thirteenth Century Translator of the "De Re Militari" of Vegetius', *Scriptorium* 6 (1952) 39-50 and 'Mastre Richard at the Skirmish of Kenilworth?', *ibid.* 7 (1953) 120-21; M. D. Legge, 'The Lord Edward's Vegetius', *ibid.* 7 (1953) 262-65. Legge's objections to Thorpe's earlier publication of the sole surviving manuscript (Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum Marley Add. 1) were ably countered by Thorpe's rejoinder. See also J. Folda, *Crusader Manuscript Illumination at Saint-Jean d'Acre, 1275-1291* (Princeton, 1976), pp. 16-17, 129-30, 199.

finances are fairly well documented for the last four years of her life (1286-90), thanks to the efforts of her executors,<sup>20</sup> and from their records it can be determined that the queen was not in the habit of bringing money from Ponthieu to England. The poor rate of exchange between sterling and the money of France cannot have favored such a course of action; moreover, in the queen's last years the county's finances were strained by the double necessity to pay her mother's and stepfather's debts, which amounted to above 14,000 *li.* of Paris, and the payment to the queen's nephew of another 14,000 *li.* agreed upon in 1284 to settle his claims on lands in Ponthieu.<sup>21</sup> Indeed, an entry on the Chancery *Liberate* Roll that contains the present schedule proves that the king and queen sent £ 1000 from England to Ponthieu in May 1281, to help pay for the purchase of new land there.<sup>22</sup> In all respects, the queen's use of the receivership in Ponthieu as her purchasing agent for business on the Continent was convenient and sensible. As far as financial administration in Ponthieu is concerned, however, it must be admitted that the schedule of 1280 is of little value, containing no information as to sources of revenue, methods of account, or the like. Its principal value lies in its picture of the administration in Ponthieu.

The purely administrative information contained in the schedule supports entirely the conclusions of Johnstone and Shealy that the English left the Ponthievin administrative structure intact as they found it, and continued to employ native Ponthievs in positions of authority there, appointing Englishmen only to the seneschalcy as their representatives.<sup>23</sup> The receiver responsible for the schedule, Pierre au Coste,<sup>24</sup> and the moneyer Gobert Andre (51) had served the queen's mother, as had Roland de Comyngant known as 'le Lombard', who became receiver of Ponthieu in 1283.<sup>25</sup> One of the clerks named frequently in the schedule,

<sup>20</sup> No accounts from Eleanor's administration survive from the years before 1286. All those cited in Parsons, *Court and Household*, pp. 3-4 nn. 2, 6, are known to be subordinate to the comprehensive summary account for the years 1286-90 prepared by her executors, audited in March 1294, and enrolled on the Pipe Roll for 26 Edward I, P.R.O. E 372/143, m. 36r.

<sup>21</sup> See below, pp. 387-94. The issues of Ponthieu did not rise much above £ 1300 during Edward I's lifetime, and were 'probably reckoned as equivalent to £ 1000' when granted to Edward II's wife in 1308 for the expenses of her chamber (Johnstone, 'The Queen's Household', in Tout, *Chapters* 5.277).

<sup>22</sup> P.R.O. C 62/57, m. 8: '*De denariis liberatis ad terram in Pontio emendam. Thesaurio et camerariis salutem. Liberate de Thesauro nostro Karissime Consorti nostre Alianore Regine Anglie mille libras ad quandam terram in Pontio per manus dilecti et fidelis nostri Thome de Sandwyz' senescalli loci eiusdem ad opus nostrum et eiusdem Consortis nostre inde emendam. Teste ut supra [apud Westmonasterium .x. die maii].*'

<sup>23</sup> Johnstone, 'The County of Ponthieu', 441-43; Shealy, *The English Administration of Ponthieu*, pp. 2-3.

<sup>24</sup> Johnstone, *ibid.*, 442 and n. 37; the name occurs as 'Petrus ad Latus' in, e.g., *RG* 3.5047 (July 1282).

<sup>25</sup> *RG* 3.5054, 5059; Johnstone, *ibid.*, 449 n. 91.

Henry de la Mote, had also served Queen Jeanne and was remembered in her will (2). Local gentry and domestic attendants were likewise taken into English service — John de Villeroy (22), Philip Popiot (60), Hugh de Famechon (40) and Jeanne's chamber valet Raoulet (8). The use of native Ponthevins in the county's administration has its parallels in a sort of geographically-determined specialization apparent among royal clerks, as for example Gonzalo Martinez (51), who invariably appears in connection with the queen's Castilian business, or the Richard de Geyton who was exclusively occupied with the administration of her estates and finances in Ireland.<sup>26</sup> This approach seems even to have had some influence on ecclesiastical preferments: just as Geyton was presented only to benefices in Ireland, the king and queen avoided almost entirely presenting English clerks to Ponthevin benefices.<sup>27</sup> Specialization of this kind among administrators was a natural enough phenomenon in a court which had responsibilities and interests in different areas, but in the context of establishing English authority in Ponthieu there was clearly an added psychological advantage for the Ponthevins, who would not find themselves confronted with an unwelcome swarm of foreign functionaries. They could continue to communicate with the count's administration as they were accustomed to do.

It was inevitable, however, that apprehension on the part of the native Ponthevins, and perhaps a little too much energy on the part of the administrators working to gain favor with the new count and countess, would result in friction, and as this developed the opposite side of Edward's coin was revealed: strict control, from England, of the native functionaries in Ponthieu. At some point apparently not long after Queen Eleanor succeeded in Ponthieu,<sup>28</sup> Hugh de Famechon, the *bailli* of Abbeville, arrested and imprisoned one Mikiel Caitive, whom the townsmen speedily snatched from Hugh's hands. It appears that the men were already unhappy with Hugh's conduct, as they later claimed that he had begun to fortify the count's house near Abbeville in contravention of their privileges. The result was a simmering dispute that was heard twice before the Paris *Parlement*,

<sup>26</sup> For published references to him, see *CIPM* 5, no. 137, where he is described as her receiver in Ireland; *Calendar of Documents Relating to Ireland* 1, nos. 1490, 1634, 1801, 2056, 2088; *CPR* 1281-1292, pp. 415-16, 419.

<sup>27</sup> See *RG* 3.5014, 5051, 5063, 5081, 5086, and *CPR* 1272-1281, p. 323. Johnstone, 'The County of Ponthieu', 440 n. 25, doubts whether the 'Ricardus Anglicus' mentioned as a former canon of Saint-Wolfran at Abbeville had ever come to claim his stall there. P.R.O. S.C. 1/17/51 is an undated letter to the king and queen from her stepfather, asking them to confirm the presentations he and his late wife had made of two Ponthevin clerks to stalls in Saint-Wolfran.

<sup>28</sup> According to C. Brunel, 'Documents sur le Pontieu conservés dans la collection de l'*Ancient Correspondence* au Public Record Office de Londres (1278-1337)', *Bulletin philologique et historique* (1918) 231-77, no. 3, one John de Sauti was still *bailli* at Abbeville c. July 1279, so Hugh's tenure there must have begun later.

at Pentecost and St. Martin 1281, although the townsmen had restored Caitive to the count's authority on 1 April 1281; the final accords between Abbeville and the king and queen were not settled until June 1282, when the townsmen submitted themselves completely to the count's authority and accepted Famechon as their *bailli*.<sup>29</sup> The schedule offers some sidelights on the early stages of the affair, not the least interesting of which is that the queen, probably in the summer of 1280, had Hugh de Famechon knighted, apparently with some pomp (40-43), and probably with the intention of impressing the men of Abbeville: the English monarchs might retain Ponthevin natives in their administration, but nobody in Ponthieu was to be left in any doubt as to the source of the authority exercised by those administrators. The ceremony was performed by John de Grailly, then the king's lieutenant in Gascony, who was sent to Ponthieu on this occasion to hear claims and demands on the men of Abbeville (74), presumably, as noted earlier, as one phase of a larger trip to France that included a visit to Paris as well. The bishop of Amiens came twice to Abbeville to deal with the dispute during the period covered by the schedule (72), and was present later when Caitive was handed back by the townsmen in April 1281, although a letter of the bishop indicates that his sympathies in the matter were with the townsmen.<sup>30</sup> The seneschal of Ponthieu went to England for three weeks to consult directly with the king and queen (67-68). Before the final agreements were reached in June 1282, more journeys to England by prominent members of the administration had been necessary.<sup>31</sup>

Regular visits to England by administrators from Ponthieu are indicated by the surviving commissions for audits, which often include specific instructions to allocate their expenses, as for example the two existing orders from 1285, showing that the seneschal Thomas de Sandwyz' had recently been in England three times by 6 June 1285, and returned at least once more before 15 October.<sup>32</sup> The king and queen were personally in Ponthieu for a short time in August 1289, but the new seneschal they appointed then, Thomas de Belhus, came to England at least once before June 1290.<sup>33</sup> This fashion of supervising and finalizing business was an obvious necessity because of the royal couple's non-residence in Ponthieu, and it left unmistakable traces on the records, which show plainly that it was most common for Ponthevin business to be dealt with in large blocks at one convenient time. Concentrated bursts of royal acts for Ponthieu can be identified in August

<sup>29</sup> The affair is discussed generally by Johnstone, 'The County of Ponthieu', 444-45; the documents may be seen in Prarond, *Cartulaire*, pp. 306, 310 (= Paris, BN lat. 10112, fols. 33r, 5r); RG 3.5039, 5041-45; Beugnet, *Les Olim* 2.173, 196; Thierry, *Recueil* 4.43, 51.

<sup>30</sup> P.R.O. S.C. 1/14/164; there is a transcript in Paris, BN Moreau 680, fol. 31r-v.

<sup>31</sup> RG 3.5047.

<sup>32</sup> RG 3.5072, 5077-78.

<sup>33</sup> RG 3.5090.

1280,<sup>34</sup> December 1281,<sup>35</sup> May and June 1282,<sup>36</sup> and June and October 1285.<sup>37</sup> The congruence between these dates and the seneschal's visit in 1280 reported by the present schedule (67-68), a journey to England by two prominent Ponthevin clerks at some point shortly before July 1282,<sup>38</sup> and the series of visits in 1285 remarked just above argue that such concentrations in fact resulted from visits and consultations with the king and queen in England.

Letters and reports, or references to them, do survive in sufficient numbers to show that the king and queen were kept fully informed on far less knotty matters than the Abbeville dispute. A letter from the seneschal Thomas de Sandwyz', at the Paris *Parlement* in July 1279, informed the king among other Ponthevin matters that the count of Dreux had already performed the homage he owed, and the day assigned for him to perform it personally in England was quashed.<sup>39</sup> About the same time the *bailli* of Abbeville reported that no judgment had yet been pronounced in the count's court in a case pending there; the forty days' limit was approaching, and if through default of judgment the king of France were to gain cognizance of the case, Edward's rights in Ponthieu would be diminished.<sup>40</sup> The researcher is dependent on the chance survival of such letters to illustrate the flow of correspondence from Ponthieu to England, but enrolments and the wardrobe accounts in England indicate the frequency with which messages of one kind or another were sent from England to Ponthieu. The present schedule shows that over some eighteen months the queen sent ten letters of credit alone (1-49), and eight other occasions are noted when messengers came from England on business that required the receiver's attention (33, 50, 53-57, 60). The schedule says nothing of additional communication with the seneschal or other officials, but such correspondence must have been carried on. Likewise, the schedule makes no reference to any documents enrolled on the Gascon Rolls during these eighteen months, and thus it is by no means a complete picture of the communications between the king and queen and the administration across the Channel. A steady stream of letters was clearly sent out in 1290: one of the queen's messengers went out three times within six weeks,<sup>41</sup> and while a commission for audit dated 3 June

<sup>34</sup> *CPR 1272-1281*, pp. 394-95; among these entries is the king's confirmation of the queen's appointment of Guillot du Vergiers as her proctor before the count of Flanders (3, 56).

<sup>35</sup> *CPR 1281-1291*, p. 6bis.

<sup>36</sup> Thierry, *Recueil* 4.51; *CPR 1281-1292*, pp. 20-21; *RG* 3.5038, 5041-45. This was likely done to clear away as much business as possible before the outset of the Welsh campaign of 1282.

<sup>37</sup> *RG* 3.5066-73, 5080.

<sup>38</sup> *RG* 3.5047.

<sup>39</sup> P.R.O. S.C. 1/20/114 (Paris, 8 July 1279). Cf. the similar request from Philip III of France concerning the homage to be performed by the new count of Dreux in 1282 (below, n. 72).

<sup>40</sup> Brunel, 'Documents sur le Pontieu', no. 3.

<sup>41</sup> Parsons, *Court and Household*, p. 19.

1290 shows that several letters of credit had been issued since August 1289 when the couple were last in Ponthieu.<sup>42</sup> Philip Popiot left the court for Ponthieu on 15 June with yet another such letter as well as a message for the queen's nephew the count of Aumâle.<sup>43</sup> A messenger arrived from Ponthieu bearing more cheeses and pelisses two days after the queen died.<sup>44</sup>

The value of such correspondence is not entirely anecdotal, for the existing letters often serve to throw light on matters otherwise known only in outline from the formalities of enrolments. It has already been seen that a letter to England from the bishop of Amiens, touching the contention with Abbeville, indicates that the bishop found the seneschal refractory, which may have had something to do with the length of time the Abbeville dispute lasted. Another disagreement, with the abbey of Forest-Montiers, is known principally through the evidence of letters which, again, hint that the bishop found life with Thomas de Sandwyz' no bed of roses. Bishop William complained that the seneschal was ignoring the wise counsel of dom Reginald of Forest-Montiers and, heeding instead advice from certain ill-disposed persons, unjustly persecuted the monastery. Thomas' explanation was that the monks, in violation of the privileges granted the town of Rue by the queen's ancestors, were busily fortifying a house of theirs within the town walls.<sup>45</sup> Were it not for these letters nothing would be known of the facts behind the only surviving enrolment concerning the matter, showing merely that the king and queen prorogued the case in December 1282.<sup>46</sup> The bishop's role in these cases raises the possibility that William took a dim view of English dominion within his diocese. As early as June 1279, while they were still in Ponthieu on their first visit, the king and queen had to nominate an attorney to oppose the bishop before the king of France,<sup>47</sup> and Shealy found evidence that the English at length had to ask King Philip to make the bishop stop meddling in Ponthevin affairs.<sup>48</sup> Clearly Edward and Eleanor were no more favorably inclined toward Bishop William than he was to their seneschal, and it is rather satisfying to discover a letter from Abbot Matthew of Saint-Denis assuring the English Chancellor, Robert Burnell, that 'from the time we first saw him' Sandwyz' had shown himself 'good, diligent and careful' in handling the business entrusted to him.<sup>49</sup>

<sup>42</sup> RG 3.5090.

<sup>43</sup> P.R.O. Controllor's book of the king's wardrobe 18 Edward I, C 47/4/5, fol. 23v.

<sup>44</sup> Parsons, *Court and Household*, p. 133.

<sup>45</sup> Respectively P.R.O. S.C. 1/22/87 and S.C. 1/24/88; neither is dated, but it is certain they involve the same matter.

<sup>46</sup> RG 3.5048. P.R.O. S.C. 1/17/122 is an undated letter from Abbot John of Forest-Montiers asking the king and queen for letters of no prejudice in favor of the abbey in consequence of the prorogation.

<sup>47</sup> RG 3.5034.

<sup>48</sup> Shealy, *The English Administration of Ponthieu*, p. 88.

<sup>49</sup> P.R.O. S.C. 1/24/77, undated. Matthew, abbot of Saint-Denis from 1258, died 25 September

The disputes illustrated by the schedule of 1280 and the ancillary documents discussed here involved relations between the king and queen and the towns and religious houses in Ponthieu, rather than with the county's aristocracy. As remarked by Johnstone,<sup>50</sup> this was a characteristic of circumstances in Ponthieu at this period: bolstered by their wealth and enjoying long-established communal rights, the towns were quick to oppose and demand,<sup>51</sup> while the monasteries, likewise secure in their wealth, could rely (as seen above) on the energetic backing of the ordinary.<sup>52</sup> The Ponthevin nobility, however, caused their new English lords few difficulties, a contrast perhaps explained only by a combination of factors. Queen Eleanor was related by blood to many of the prominent families of the region: the counts of Eu and Dreux who owed military service to Ponthieu,<sup>53</sup> the lords of Fiennes,<sup>54</sup> the lords of Picquigny<sup>55</sup> and the lords of Roncherolles.<sup>56</sup> All of

1286 (D. Sammarthan and P. Piolin, eds., *Gallia christiana*, 2nd edition, 13 vols. [Paris, 1856-74], 7, cols. 391-95). In the summer or early autumn of 1279 the men of Abbeville praised Thomas for his diligence on their behalf (Brunel, 'Documents sur le Ponthieu', no. 4), but as they were writing to Edward for help in obtaining from Philip III a reduction in the heavy *amende* levied on them in the matter of Feuquières (below, p. 386 and n. 74), it might have been thought well to say something complimentary about Thomas.

<sup>50</sup> Johnstone, 'The County of Ponthieu', 440, 446.

<sup>51</sup> See also RG 3.5038, 5072 (which may concern a matter different from 5038) and Prarond, *Cartulaire*, pp. 316-18 (= Paris, BN lat. 10112, fols. 300v-301r).

<sup>52</sup> For the Feuquières incident, involving the abbey of Saint-Riquier, see below, p. 386 and n. 74. See also RG 3.5066-67, and Prarond, *Cartulaire*, p. 319 (= Paris, BN lat. 10112, fols. 191v-192v), for a dispute with the abbey of Dommartin (*alias* Saint-Josse-au-Bois); and for a similar dispute with Saint-Saulve at Montreuil see RG 3.5080. Another document relating to the Saint-Saulve settlement is Paris AN J 237 no. 95 (June 1286). In 1290 there was a disagreement with Notre-Dame at Le Gard; Prarond, *Cartulaire*, pp. 342-43 gives a very sketchy calendar of documents in Paris, BN lat. 10112, fols. 366v, 370v.

<sup>53</sup> For the queen's kinship to the Brienne counts of Eu see Parsons, *Court and Household*, pp. 41, 45. The military service owed to Ponthieu was settled by agreement in 1234-35 (Brunel, *Recueil*, no. 297) and was again acknowledged by Count John in the summer of 1283 (Paris, BN lat. 10112, fol. 121v, apparently overlooked by Prarond, *Cartulaire*). See also below, p. 395 and n. 110.

Eleanor was more remotely related to the counts of Dreux, who inherited the honor of Saint-Valéry-sur-Somme in Ponthieu; see below, p. 385, for the descent of Saint-Valéry from the counts of Ponthieu, and also G. H. Fowler, 'De St-Waléry', *The Genealogist* N. S. 30 (1914) 1-17. On the counts of Dreux see 'le père Anselme de la Vierge Marie' [Pierre de Guibours], *Histoire généalogique et chronologique de la maison royale de France, des pairs, grands officiers de la Couronne* ..., 9 vols. (Paris 1726-33), 1.426-42. See also below, p. 386.

<sup>54</sup> Parsons, *Court and Household*, pp. 44-46. William de Fiennes, two of whose daughters were taken to England by the queen and married there, was named *custos* of the county twice, in the spring of 1279 (*CPR 1272-1279*, p. 306), and again ten years later (RG 3.5083-84).

<sup>55</sup> Parsons, *ibid.*, pp. 50-52. See also below, p. 395 and n. 110.

<sup>56</sup> Brunel, *Recueil*, nos. 400, 402, where Jeanne mentions her *consanguineus* Eudes de Roncherolles, 1256-57; before her death she and her second husband purchased 120 *li.* worth of land from Eudes (RG 3.5064). In 1260, Nevlon, son of John de Roncherolles, visited England and was given 20 marks by Henry III for his journey home (*CC1R 1259-1261*, p. 91). In December 1279 the lord of la Ferté (see below, p. 395) certified to the seneschal of Ponthieu that a John de Roncherolles was the heir to an annual rent of 30 *li.* granted his ancestors by the counts of Ponthieu (Paris, BN lat. 10112, fol. 61v, of which there is a very inadequate notice in Prarond, *Cartulaire*, pp. 291-92).



these she patronized, and the example of such influential houses enjoying profitable royal favor may have affected the attitude of other families. There is reason to believe, secondly, that some members of the lesser nobility in Ponthieu at this period were enduring financial constraints,<sup>57</sup> so that they were perhaps preoccupied with their own fortunes rather than with offering a concerted opposition to authority. Immediately after the queen's accession in 1279, she and the king began to purchase a great deal of land in Ponthieu, most of it from the noble class; something of the scale of their efforts may be gauged from the £ 1000 mentioned earlier, sent in May 1281 from England to Ponthieu to buy land there. At least twenty-four such transactions are recorded down to the time of Eleanor's death in November 1290,<sup>58</sup> and a number of these conveyances contain clauses stating explicitly that the vendor was acting from 'great necessity', or from 'great poverty, sworn and proved, which constrains me'.<sup>59</sup> It is tempting to relate these purchases, and the stated reason for at least some of them, to the series of similar acquisitions in England that made Eleanor so notorious there. Although the financial situation of the knightly class in England in the thirteenth century remains the subject of debate, there can be no question that the majority of Eleanor's land purchases in England involved landholders of decidedly middling status, exactly the group known to have been most heavily indebted at this period to the Jewish usurers through whom Eleanor was accustomed to operate, to the outrage of many Englishmen and to the strongly expressed concern of Archbishop Pecham.<sup>60</sup> If the

<sup>57</sup> R. Fossier, *La terre et les hommes en Picardie jusqu'à la fin du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, 2 vols. (Louvain, 1968), pp. 606-23 and *Histoire de la Picardie* (Toulouse, 1974), pp. 159-63. Fossier believes that the troubled economy in Picardy at this period was especially inimical to lesser lords who did not command the *ban*, and lacked the capacity to increase profits from the exercise of justice.

<sup>58</sup> The majority of these transactions are recorded by individual charters now in Paris, AN J 235-37. Most of these overlap with material in Paris, BN lat. 10112, of which notices (usually with shortened texts) can be seen in Prarond, *Cartulaire* (in chronological order), pp. 284-85, 288, 24-95bis, 304, 296, 299, 303, 311-12, 308, 320-21, 331-34, 338, 341-43, 338, 341-42, 344-46. Sales by André de Ponches in February 1281 (N. S.) and John, lord of Wascoigne in A.D. 1284, are recorded in Paris, AN J 235, nos. 32, 34, but are not found in Paris, BN lat. 10112. At least three transactions appear in Paris, BN Grenier 298, nos. 52, 54, 55, without duplication by either of the above references; others in Grenier can be found among the above. This list does not take into account the purchases made from the queen's stepfather (below, n. 108).

<sup>59</sup> 'nimia necessitate urgente' (Prarond, *Cartulaire*, pp. 284-85 = lat. 10112, fol. 278v); 'par grant necessite, qui le constraignoit' (Prarond, p. 288 = fol. 341r-v); 'par grand necessite' (Prarond, pp. 294-95 = fols. 136r, 134v); 'par necessite constreignent' (Prarond, p. 304 = fols. 117r-118r); 'necessitate urgente' (Prarond, pp. 311-12 = fols. 16v-17r); 'par grant povrete qui me constrangnoit juree et aprouvee' (Paris, AN J 235, no. 34); 'par necessite juree et souffisamment prouvee' (Prarond, pp. 331-34 = fols. 389v-390r).

<sup>60</sup> Parsons, *Court and Household*, pp. 17-22, and *Eleanor of Castile (1241-1290) and the English Queenship in the Thirteenth Century* (Diss. Toronto, 1980), especially chapter 3. See also: P. R. Coss, 'Sir Geoffrey de Langley and the Crisis of the Knightly Class in Thirteenth-Century England', *Past & Present* 68 (1975) 3-37; R. H. Britnell, 'Minor Landlords in England and Medieval Agrarian Capitalism', *ibid.* 89 (1980) 3-22; D. A. Carpenter, 'Was There a Crisis of the Knightly Class in the

economic situation of the lesser nobility in Ponthieu, as indicated by these conveyances to the king and queen, was similar to that in England, these families could have found it difficult to sustain contention with their count, and might have found it advisable to seek favor and patronage. This may have been the case with Hugh de Famechon, the *bailli* of Abbeville mentioned earlier, some members of whose family were apparently among those 'compelled by great necessity' to sell land to the king and queen, in 1285.<sup>61</sup> Others may have been the lord of Villeroiy (22) and Philip Popiot (60).

A third factor contributing to the lack of friction between the king and queen and the Ponthevin nobility lay in the nature of comital power as it had been developed in Ponthieu over the preceding centuries, perhaps under the strong influence of the neighboring Norman state with its tradition of unified ducal power.<sup>62</sup> In essence, the nobility of Ponthieu had not established themselves as successful rivals to the count's authority; the counts of Ponthieu did not have to contend with the descendants of earlier officials who had managed to pass their powers along to their offspring. The administration of Ponthieu had developed out of the count's entourage and shared comital authority only by delegation, as for example the *vicomtes*, who in Edward's time remained only appointed financial officials responsible to the count for the revenues of their bailiwicks.<sup>63</sup> Some reflection of this relationship between count and aristocracy may be seen in Edward's handling of the confirmation of a grant of land by the lord of Mons-Boubert to his sister, in 1285: the king, who would publish *Quia Emptores* in England five years later, stipulated that the sister was to hold the land not of her brother, but of the count.<sup>64</sup> The balance between the count and his nobles in

Thirteenth Century? The Oxfordshire Evidence', *EHR* 95 (1980) 721-52; S. Raban, 'The Land Market and the Aristocracy in the Thirteenth Century' in *Tradition and Change: Essays in Honour of Marjorie Chibnall*, eds. D. Greenaway, C. Holdsworth, and J. Sayers (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 239-61.

<sup>61</sup> '... nimia necessitate evidenter urgente' (Prarond, *Cartulaire*, pp. 320-23 = Paris, BN lat. 10112, fols. 215v, 18r). The sale was made by Pierre and John de Famechon, brothers, their sister Mabilie, and Hawedis 'de la Verche', widow of Gontier de Famechon. Their relationship to Hugh is unclear.

<sup>62</sup> Some Norman influence is to be detected in the similar nature of *vicomtés* as financial administrative units of the duke of Normandy and the counts of Ponthieu. It is likely that some influence from Flanders was also felt in Ponthieu, and Shealy, *The English Administration of Ponthieu*, pp. 7-8, suggests that the splendor of the comital entourage in Ponthieu was influenced by the example of the French royal court. See A. Luchaire, *Manuel des institutions françaises. Période des Capétiens directs* (Paris, 1892), pp. 285, 485, and McDonald, *The Countship of Ponthieu*, pp. 185, 201-202.

<sup>63</sup> The form of oath taken by new *vicomtes* of Abbeville may be seen in Prarond, *Cartulaire*, p. 244 (= Paris, BN lat. 10112, fol. 3v). Edward I and Eleanor of Castile farmed *vicomtés* to creditors who lent money to assist in paying the debts left by the queen's mother (RG 3.5055).

<sup>64</sup> RG 3.5068; cf. the disputed homage offered to the count of Dreux by the lord of Boulaincourt, who should have performed it only to the king-count (Prarond, *Cartulaire*, pp. 328-30 = Paris, BN lat. 10112, fol. 83v).

Ponthieu, then, was favorable to the efficient exercise of the count's power, and a king of Edward's energy and determination could be relied upon not to countenance any alterations in that situation.

The schedule does, however, allude to the fact that the queen's accession in Ponthieu had inevitably involved the couple in a new network of feudal relationships in which they themselves were the vassals. The 'plea of Flanders' (56), for which Eleanor appointed Guillot du Vergier her attorney in August 1280, involved a mysterious fief she claimed, as countess of Ponthieu, to hold of the count of Flanders. The origins of this fief may be tentatively attributed to the kinship that existed between John I, count of Ponthieu from 1172 to 1191, and Philip of Alsace, count of Flanders from 1168 to 1191, although it is just as difficult to account for that kinship.<sup>65</sup> The only evidence for a Flemish fief in the house of Ponthieu before Eleanor's time concerns a *terre* in Flanders called 'la Vaccherie' or 'le Berquerie', granted in *maritagium* by John I to his daughter Adela, when she married the lord of Saint-Valéry-sur-Somme in 1178.<sup>66</sup> Eleanor may have been ignorant of that grant, assuming that the fief was still hers to claim, for she granted it, 'wherever it may be', to her household steward Sir John Ferré in January 1280.<sup>67</sup> It is unclear why a proctor had to be sent to Flanders the next summer, but the last thing heard of the matter is the appointment in May 1282 of proctors to receive from the count of Flanders 50 *li.* Flemish, due the queen as a money fee.<sup>68</sup>

It was with the French king, of course, that the most important feudal ties existed, and the evidence suggests that the English handled that delicate connec-

<sup>65</sup> Philip called John *cognatus* in an undated letter between 1172 and 1190 (Brunel, *Recueil*, no. 122). One possibility is that Count John's mother Ida, whose parentage is unknown, descended from one of the two marriages of Philip's paternal grandmother Gertrude of Flanders (d. 1117), through whom Philip's father Thierry 'of Alsace' inherited Flanders in 1128. The texts relative to Gertrude's marriages and issue are, respectively, *Genealogia ducum Brabantiae heredum Franciae*, ed. G. Waitz (MGH SS 25; Hanover, 1880), p. 390, and *Chronica Albrici monachi Trium Fontium*, ed. P. Scheffer-Boichorst (MGH SS 23; Hanover, 1874), p. 871. See also: W. K. Von Isenburg-Büdingen and F. Freytag von Loringhoven, *Stammtafeln zur Geschichte der europäischen Staaten*, 3rd edition, 4 vols. in 3 (Marburg, 1965), 2.8, 9, 13; J. Lanz, *Die Ahnen Konradins des letzten Hohenstaufen* (Vienna, 1971), pp. 5, 9; M. Parisse, *Noblesse et chevalerie en Lorraine médiévale. Les familles nobles du XI<sup>e</sup> au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Nancy, 1982), p. 400. By her first marriage to Count Henry III of Louvain (d. 1095) Gertrude had four daughters of whom virtually nothing is known except that one of them was a great-grandmother of the wife of Frederick Barbarossa. By her second marriage to Duke Thierry II of Lorraine (d. 1115) Gertrude had Thierry 'of Alsace', a son who became bishop of Toul, and a daughter who married the castellan of Brancion in the Mâconnais. After he succeeded in Flanders, Thierry 'of Alsace' might have made some provision for his older sisters who were apparently excluded from any claims to their paternal lands in Louvain. Chronologically, it is impossible that Count John of Ponthieu's mother Ida could have been among those sisters, but she could have been a daughter of one of them.

<sup>66</sup> Prarond, *Cartulaire*, pp. 20-24 (= Paris, BN lat. 10112, fol. 213r), 57-61 (= fol. 206v).

<sup>67</sup> CPR 1272-1281, p. 359.

<sup>68</sup> CPR 1281-1292, p. 20.

tion with considerable caution. Louis IX had hoped that his children would remain in peace with the children of Henry III because they were cousins; but there seems always to have been a certain wariness between Edward and Philip III, albeit not necessarily to the extent implied by an anonymous Limoges chronicler who compared the affection between the two to that of a dog and a cat.<sup>69</sup> There is at any rate little to suggest that relations between Edward and Philip III were disturbed by circumstances in Ponthieu. For his part, the English king fulfilled his obligations, carefully seeing to it that military service was proffered from Ponthieu in 1282 and 1283.<sup>70</sup> Philip in 1279 graciously pardoned the relief due from the king and queen for the county,<sup>71</sup> the first of several incidents that almost suggest an old-boy network between the cousins: Philip in 1282 asking Edward to defer receiving homage from the new count of Dreux because the weather was too bad for a Channel crossing until the spring,<sup>72</sup> Edward as noted earlier asking Philip to cause the bishop of Amiens to cease interfering in Ponthieu affairs. In matters of justice there was more at stake, however, and the possibilities of friction consequently greater. In 1284 Philip did not seek to protect one of his servants who had committed a crime in Montreuil, but left judgment of the case to the town's *échevinage*,<sup>73</sup> and Edward seems to have conceded that in the case of trespasses committed by the men of Abbeville against the men of Saint-Riquier at Feuquières, the judgment pronounced against them was correct, although he and Eleanor were able to persuade Philip to reduce the *amende* by 2500 *li.* of Tours.<sup>74</sup> But beyond

<sup>69</sup> *Majus chronicon lemovicense*, ed. J. D. Guignault and J. N. de Wailly in *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, ed. M. Bouquet, 24 vols. (Paris, 1738-1904), 21.784.

<sup>70</sup> RG 3.5046 (2 July 1282); Paris, BN Grenier 298, no. 51a-b, are respectively a memorandum of military service done by the seneschal of Ponthieu for that county, bringing with him four knights (dated Tours, the octave of Trinity A.D. 1283), and the summons from Philip III to the host (dated Corbeil, 17 April A.D. 1283). See also RG 3.5061 (14 November 1283).

<sup>71</sup> RG 3.5013. The queen's mother in 1272 contested the right of the French king to demand *rachat* from her, since she had inherited Ponthieu from her mother and not from a collateral relative, but Jeanne afterwards acknowledged that the payment was owed (Brunel, *Recueil*, nos. 452-53).

<sup>72</sup> L. G. O.-F. de Bréquigny and M. Champollion-Figéac, eds., *Lettres de rois, reines, et autres personnages des cours de France et d'Angleterre depuis Louis VII jusqu'à Henri IV*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1839-1847), 1, no. 190 (dated 26 October, no year). The editors assign the letter to 1279; but the seneschal's letter of 8 July 1279 discussed above (see p. 380) informs the king that the count of Dreux has already performed homage, so that the day assigned for him to do it in England is quashed. It seems more likely that Philip's letter refers to the accession of John II of Dreux in 1282.

<sup>73</sup> Beugnet, *Les Olim* 2.234.

<sup>74</sup> There is a good deal of information from scattered published sources on the Feuquières affair. In chronological order: Beugnet, *ibid.* 2.131; P.R.O. S.C. 1/14/126, published by Brunel, 'Documents sur le Ponthieu', no. 4; Ch.-V. Langlois, 'Nouveaux fragments du *Liber inquestarum* de Nicolas de Chartres (1269-1298)', *BEC* 46 (1885) 446-47; Beugnet, *ibid.* 2.172-73, 234. At the instance of Edward and Eleanor, Philip III reduced the *amende* and allowed that the remaining balance might be paid by yearly instalments of 1000 *li.* (P.R.O. S.C. 1/14/127a, dated 30 October 1283).

a certain point Edward saw little reason to give Philip any opportunity to involve himself in Ponthevin matters. For example, in 1279 in a case noted above, wherein Philip was very near to gaining cognizance over a Ponthevin case in which the count's court was tardy in rendering judgment, it seems that Edward lost little time in setting matters straight.<sup>75</sup> It seems, then, that in most areas Edward and Philip maintained courteous or at least tranquil contact; it was only upon the accession in 1285 of the less tractable Philip IV that difficulties quickly developed.<sup>76</sup>


The care with which Edward and Eleanor handled the relationship with the French Crown is shown by examination of the schedule's references to the 'plea of John de Pontheiu' (57) and 'the debts of the land' (33). Both these matters, the first a dispute over Eleanor's inheritance, and the other, the legacy of debt left by her mother, were potentially damaging to English interests in Pontheiu during the fragile period immediately following the queen's accession there. The methods adopted in dealing with them illustrate quite well the two sides of Edward's policy in dealing with the king of France: a willing resort to the authority of the French king if it seemed the better way to secure a favorable result, but a firm determination to keep away from French attention anything that might lead to a less positive outcome.

John de Pontheiu was Queen Eleanor's nephew, the son of her deceased elder brother Ferdinand, and his existence introduced into the Ponthevin succession a situation largely misunderstood by modern scholars. Discussion of the problem will be aided by an abbreviated table of the descendants of Eleanor's mother Jeanne:<sup>77</sup>

<sup>75</sup> Brunel, *ibid.*, no. 3.

<sup>76</sup> Beugnet, *ibid.* 2.48-49.

<sup>77</sup> On the dates of birth for Jeanne's children see J. C. Parsons, 'The Year of Eleanor of Castile's Birth and Her Children by Edward I', *Mediaeval Studies* 46 (1984) 245-49. The year of her son Ferdinand's death is not certain, but is inferred from his widow's second marriage, which took place before December 1267, and his son's birth, apparently c. 1263 (see below, n. 92); A. de Barthélémy, 'Notice historique sur la maison de Grandpré', *Revue de Champagne et de Brie* 10 (1881) 38-41. On Louis' marriage and issue see F. Simón y Nieto, 'San Salvador del Nogal', *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia* 35 (1899) 197; J. González, *Reinado y diplomas de Fernando III*, vol. 1: *Estudio* (Cordoba, 1980), p. 117; F. Menéndez Pidal de Navascués, *Heráldica medieval española*, vol. 1: *La Casa Real de León y Castilla* (Madrid, 1982), pp. 105-106 (where it is suggested that Louis may also have left a daughter). Louis is said to have been living in the autumn of 1272 (A. Ballesteros Beretta, *Alfonso X el Sabio* [Barcelona, 1963], p. 570), but he was certainly dead before his mother made her testament in June 1276 (Brunel, *Recueil*, no. 466).



The complications arose from the fact that Jeanne's inheritance was a double one. Jeanne had inherited Ponthieu at the death of her mother, Marie Talvas, in 1250. It was only later, some years after the death of her cousin Mahaut de Dammartin in 1258, that Jeanne was recognized as countess of Aumâle although that county had been granted by Philip Augustus in 1204 to Jeanne's uncle Renaud (Mahaut's father), not to Jeanne's father Simon.<sup>78</sup> What led, in part, to the dispute between Eleanor of Castile and her nephew was the fact that Jeanne's two counties 'moved' according to two different customs of inheritance. Ponthieu lay in Picardy, where customary law demanded that whenever there was no surviving adult heir in the direct line, as there was not in this case, then the eldest living heir must be accepted as the successor, even though grandchildren in the senior line might be excluded.<sup>79</sup> Aumâle, on the other hand, lay in Normandy, and here custom

<sup>78</sup> There is a brief sketch of the origins and descent of Aumâle to 1204 in G. E. Cokayne, *The Complete Peerage*, 13 vols. (London, 1910-40) [hereafter G.E.C.], 1.350-57. For the grant to Renaud de Dammartin (December 1204) see H. F. Delaborde, É. Berger, C. Brunel, M. J. Monicat and M. J. Boussard, eds., *Recueil des actes de Philippe Auguste roi de France*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1916-66), 2, no. 836, and J. B. Teulet, ed., *Layettes du Trésor des chartes*, 6 vols. in 5 (Paris, 1863-1909), 1, no. 733. *L'art de vérifier les dates*, 3rd edition, 3 vols. (Paris, 1783-87), 2.791-92, states that Renaud's younger brother Simon (Jeanne's father) became count of Aumâle, but does not suggest how this might have come about. Simon was granted some land in the Avranchin by Philip II in 1206, and Renaud gave his brother 500 *li.* of land in Normandy in 1208 when Simon was betrothed to the Ponthevin heiress (L. Delisle, ed., *Cartulaire normand de Philippe-Auguste, Louis VIII, Saint-Louis et Philippe-le-Hardi* [Caen, 1852; rpt. Geneva, 1978], nos. 141, 168). But in his collected acts, Simon, count of Ponthieu *jure uxoris*, never used the title count of Aumâle (Brunel, *Recueil*, nos. 287-320). For documents showing that Renaud and his daughter Mahaut continued to hold Aumâle until her death see Teulet, *ibid.* 1, nos. 925-26 and 2, nos. 1629, 2449; Delisle, *ibid.*, nos. 425, 497, 1155-56. Simon's daughter Jeanne appears with the title countess of Aumâle only from October 1263, although Mahaut had died five years earlier (Brunel, *ibid.*, no. 424). For the devolution of the county of Dammartin upon Mahaut's death, see *L'art de vérifier les dates* 2.662-63.

<sup>79</sup> Brunel, *Recueil*, p. ix, and 'Documents sur le Ponthieu', 240 n. 2; J. Brissaud, *A History of French Private Law*, trans. R. Howell (Boston, 1912), pp. 650-51; T. F. T. Plucknett, *A Concise*

required that the senior heir of line must succeed, regardless of age or sex.<sup>80</sup> According to the two systems, then, Eleanor had the better claim to Ponthieu as the elder of Jeanne's living descendants, while John, as his grandmother's representative heir in the direct line, had the stronger claim to Aumâle.

Viewed in this light, the circumstances of the Ponthevin succession in 1279 were really not complicated; indeed, Jeanne's testament, drawn up in 1276, clearly anticipated that John de Ponthieu would not inherit that county.<sup>81</sup> To suggest that Philip III in 1279 settled the case 'on its own merits' implies that he had some capacity to meddle with the customs of inheritance and ignores the force of customary law in determining the matter.<sup>82</sup> Given the fact that in 1235 the French Crown had intervened to stop Jeanne's intended marriage to Henry III of England precisely to prevent Ponthieu from falling into English hands,<sup>83</sup> it is ironic that forty-four years later Philip III had no choice but to admit the claims of Jeanne's daughter, herself now queen of England, to that same county.

It was the English king and queen who, in March 1279, began the muddling of a relatively straightforward situation by laying claim to Aumâle as if it were merely a part of Ponthieu.<sup>84</sup> It is doubtful whether Edward and Eleanor could have been ignorant of the fact that the two counties were only accidentally joined in a personal union under Jeanne, and their reasons for advancing the claim are a mystery; but John de Ponthieu had been provided with more than enough ammunition to offer a stunning counterblast to his aunt and uncle. Jeanne had

*History of the Common Law*, 5th edition (London, 1956), pp. 716-18. For a civil judgment decided on this principle by the *échevinage* of Abbeville in a private inheritance case in the late thirteenth century, see Thierry, *Recueil* 4.62-64. The devolution of the county of Dammartin (above, n. 78) offers another example: at the death of her childless cousin Mahaut in 1258, Jeanne de Dammartin was the senior heir of line, as the eldest daughter of Mahaut's father's brother. But Dammartin, in Picardy like Ponthieu, was inherited by the son of a sister of Renaud and Simon, since that son was older than Jeanne.

<sup>80</sup> Brissaud, *ibid.*, pp. 650-51; F. Pollock and F. W. Maitland, *The History of English Law before the Time of Edward I*, 2nd edition, 2 vols. (London, 1898; rpt. Cambridge, 1968), 2.283-86.

<sup>81</sup> Brunel, *Recueil*, no. 466. The testament makes no reference whatever to the succession in either county; that would be settled among Jeanne's surviving descendants by the customary laws of inheritance. The laws of inheritance also explain why the so-called Treaty of Amiens contains no clause providing for Eleanor's succession in Ponthieu (Rymer, *Foedera* 1.571); there was no need for such a clause.

<sup>82</sup> Johnstone, 'The County of Ponthieu', 436-37.

<sup>83</sup> *CPR 1232-1247*, pp. 25, 74; Rymer, *Foedera* 1.216-18, 231, 284*bis*. Matthew Paris believed that French intervention was the reason for the failure of the marriage (*Chronica majora*, 7 vols. [RS 57; London, 1872-83], 3.327-28). Jeanne's father promised in 1231 not to marry his two eldest daughters without permission from the king of France (Brunel, *Recueil*, no. 287), and on 31 August 1237 papal dispensations were granted for Jeanne and her next sister, Philippa, to marry respectively Ferdinand III of Castile and his eldest son, later Alphonso X (L. Auvray, ed., *Les registres de Grégoire IX*, 4 vols. [Paris, 1890-1955], nos. 3847, 3849).

<sup>84</sup> *CPR 1272-1281*, p. 306, where 'Aubermarle in Ponthieu' is treated only as though a town within the county.

drawn up her testament in such way that her grandson was able, in his turn, to claim not only the county of Aumâle but a sizeable portion of Ponthieu as well. He was to inherit all the lands Jeanne had granted his father Ferdinand in 1257, and also (or so John claimed) the fifth part of the county Jeanne was legally able to dispose of by testament, according to the custom of Picardy. In addition, John was ultimately to inherit all the lands Jeanne had purchased in her lifetime; he would enter at once the purchases she had made as a widow, and he was bequeathed the reversion to the lands she had acquired during her second marriage to John de Falvy. Moreover, in all these lands John de Ponthieu was to enjoy high and low justice, and all homages.<sup>85</sup> If Jeanne's legacies to her grandson were followed to the letter, Edward I would be faced not only with the fragmenting of his wife's inheritance but with conflicting franchises as well, a situation that ran counter to every aspect of Edward's approach to orderly government.

John de Ponthieu appeared before Edward I immediately after Queen Eleanor was recognized as countess of Ponthieu, and formally laid claim to Jeanne's bequests.<sup>86</sup> In July 1279 the new count and countess of Ponthieu received Philip III's permission to appoint a proctor to represent them against John before the Paris *Parlement*; when the seneschal Thomas de Sandwyz' conveyed this information, he suggested that one Bernard de Doissencourt would be the best man for the job.<sup>87</sup> Whether Bernard was ever appointed is unknown; a William le Vineroun (or de Vigneroun) was accredited in November 1279.<sup>88</sup> As shown by the present schedule, in the summer of 1280 Henry de Grandison and the younger Accursi were involved in this business; they may have been the attorneys present at Paris in Pentecost term 1280, when John de Ponthieu established his right to inherit his grandmother's purchases in land, a decision to which the English king and queen assented, though on the express condition that John agree to shoulder a commensurate portion of his late grandmother's debts, which, as will be seen, were at the same time causing Edward and Eleanor no end of trouble.<sup>89</sup>

<sup>85</sup> Neither in the testament of June 1276 nor in a codicil of March 1279 is there any reference to the fifth part of the county (Brunel, *Recueil*, nos. 466, 478). Possibly it was a deathbed legacy, which might account for the impressive number of witnesses John de Ponthieu brought with him to confront Edward (RG 3.5037). Jeanne's grant of lands to her son Ferdinand is Brunel, *ibid.*, no. 405. On the individual's capacity to bequeath one fifth of the patrimony, see Brissaud, *A History of French Private Law*, pp. 738-41.

<sup>86</sup> RG 3.5037.

<sup>87</sup> P.R.O. S.C. 1/20/114 (Paris, 8 July 1279).

<sup>88</sup> P.R.O. S.C. 1/13/22 is an undated draft (with corrections) of the document appointing William, found by Shealy, *The English Administration of Ponthieu*, p. 176 (dated 15 November 1279). The draft has been revised to carry a less obsequious tone in its address to Philip; William is identified as an Englishman.

<sup>89</sup> Beugnet, *Les Olim* 2.160.



In the next few years, the course of the dispute can be seen only from successive appointments of proctors to represent Edward and Eleanor in Paris,<sup>90</sup> even after Aumâle was adjudged to John de Ponthieu in 1281.<sup>91</sup> It was not until 1284 that all claims were at last resolved by what appears to have been a simple compromise: John de Ponthieu agreed to renounce his claims to the fifth part of Ponthieu and other rights there, in return for 14,000 *li.* of Paris,<sup>92</sup> and, perhaps, the consent of Edward and Eleanor to drop their claims to Aumâle, since it is only after 1284 that John appears with that title.<sup>93</sup> After this agreement, the count of Aumâle appears to have improved his relations with England, and he certainly retained at least some influence in Ponthievin affairs.<sup>94</sup> This did not, however, prevent him putting forward another claim to the county of Ponthieu after his aunt's death, on the grounds that he was older than the future Edward II.<sup>95</sup>

The question of comital successions could not very easily have been kept out of the French king's purview, and the English king and queen may have sought to have their claims thrashed out in the legal forum precisely to assure themselves of an advantageous decision, or at least in the hope of obtaining a satisfactory

<sup>90</sup> *CPR 1281-1292*, pp. 6, 20, 29; *RG* 3.5056.

<sup>91</sup> E. Boutaric, *Actes du Parlement de Paris*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1863; rpt. Hildesheim, 1975), 1.366 (no. 427); J. A. Kicklighter, *English-Rekated Cases at the Parlement of Paris, 1259-1337* (Diss. Emory, 1973), p. 260. Cf. Brunel, 'Documents sur le Pontieu', no. 7.

<sup>92</sup> F. Palgrave, ed., *Antient Kalendars and Inventories of the Treasury of His Majesty's Exchequer*, 3 vols. (London, 1836), 1.144. The 14,000 *li.* were not fully paid until May 1293 (*CPR 1292-1302*, p. 13). The 'other rights' surrendered by John in 1284 almost certainly included his claims to the land purchases made by Jeanne during her marriage to John de Falvy, since it was only after 1284 that the king and queen began to buy these from Falvy (below, n. 108).

<sup>93</sup> The record of the 1284 settlement (see preceding note) is the earliest instance of the title that has come to hand. It is possible that John de Ponthieu's age had some bearing on the end of the dispute. The age of majority for holding fiefs in Ponthieu was fifteen, but in Normandy it was twenty-one (H. d'Arbois de Jubainville, 'Recherches sur la minorité et ses effets dans le droit féodal français', *BEC* 13 [1851-52] 535-37). In 1279, John claimed that he could have held his father's lands in Ponthieu before Jeanne died, but he had not asked for them as he did not wish to offend her (*RG* 3.5037). This argues that he was at least fifteen by March 1279. Since Aumâle was in Normandy, however, John would have had to wait until the age of twenty-one before being recognized as its count, and this raises the presumption that he might have reached that age only in 1284, when the compromise with Edward and Eleanor was effected. If so, John would have been born c. 1263, and might have turned fifteen only a very short time before Jeanne's death, perhaps a more realistic explanation as to why he had not demanded his father's lands before March 1279.

<sup>94</sup> In addition to the settlement of 1284 (see above, n. 92), cf. Prarond, *Cartulaire*, pp. 329-30 (= Paris, BN lat. 10112, fol. 83v). Prarond, p. 338 (= fol. 119r) omits the witness list to an act of August 1289 that includes the count of Aumâle. See also Parsons, *Court and Household*, pp. 77, 83, and above, p. 381, for reference to a letter Eleanor sent her nephew in June 1290.

<sup>95</sup> Beugnet, *Les Olim* 2.420-21. The explicit reference there to the question of the ages of John and Edward, and Philip IV's desire to be more fully informed on that point, strengthens the argument that Eleanor succeeded in Ponthieu as the elder of her mother's living descendants.

compromise. It is not impossible that their claim to Aumâle in 1279 was advanced with the deliberate intention to force the question into the court of the French king, and in the long run this proved to be a wise opening gambit. In the matter of the burden of debt they inherited in Ponthieu, however, it is clear that Edward and Eleanor were willing to go to any lengths to avoid allowing the king of France to gain a hand in the situation.

The counts of Ponthieu in the thirteenth century were chronically indebted, due in part to the territory ceded by Jeanne's mother Marie in 1225, when she submitted herself and her children to Louis VIII after her husband Simon had treasonably joined his brother Renaud in league against Philip Augustus.<sup>96</sup> After Simon's death in 1239, Marie married again, and her second husband Matthew de Montmorency ran the comital finances so deeply into the red that the couple were compelled to sell off much of their own land.<sup>97</sup> But while available evidence does suggest that some of Jeanne's indebtedness resulted from purchases of land to replace her mother's losses, there are also clear indications that Jeanne and John de Falvy ran up not inconsiderable debts to tradesmen as well. Upon Jeanne's death, Falvy lost his rights as count of Ponthieu and was left helpless against his creditors, who naturally began at once to demand payment, and probably at some point shortly after Jeanne died Falvy sent to England a letter explaining how matters stood. The letter ends with a canny hint that the creditors were already threatening to approach the French king to obtain payment.<sup>98</sup> It was presumably to avoid that eventuality that Edward and Eleanor agreed, in July 1279, to assume Falvy's share of the debts in addition to Jeanne's portion.<sup>99</sup>

John de Lovetot, the queen's auditor who was also responsible for the Ponthievin audit of December 1280 that produced the present schedule, was already occupied with certain business in Ponthieu by September 1279, and, given his important position in Eleanor's financial administration in England as well as in Ponthieu, it is not unlikely that the carefully sealed documents he retrieved in that month were connected with the late countess' debts.<sup>100</sup> By the end of 1279, the receiver of Ponthieu had been sent £ 761:6:1, equivalent to 2373 *li.* 15 *s.* 6 *d.* of Paris, to pay certain merchants of Arras what Jeanne owed them.<sup>101</sup> This was only a

<sup>96</sup> Fossier, *La terre et les hommes*, pp. 617, 620, 624-25. Marie's submission to Louis VIII is Brunel, *Recueil*, no. 278 (July 1225); Louis' acceptance of the terms is Prarond, *Cartulaire*, p. 132 (= Paris, BN lat. 10112, fol. 220r). When Marie's husband Simon submitted himself to Louis IX in March 1231 (N. S.), he had to find surety for 500 *li.* (Delisle, *Cartulaire normand*, no. 1141).

<sup>97</sup> Prarond, *Histoire d'Abbeville*, pp. 117-18.

<sup>98</sup> P.R.O. S.C. 1/17/48, undated, but clearly before Edward and Eleanor agreed to assume Falvy's share of the debts in July 1279.

<sup>99</sup> RG 3.5019.

<sup>100</sup> CPR 1272-1281, p. 319; RG 3.5104. Throughout the 1280s Lovetot was regularly among those commissioned to audit the accounts in Ponthieu.

<sup>101</sup> Palgrave, *Antient Kalendars* 1.144.

temporary expedient, and probably early the next year Falvy again complained to Edward about the unsettled debts; some of his property had been seized by the creditors, to his shame and, by implication, the king's as well.<sup>102</sup> Either this letter, or a third which seems to have followed it, may have provoked the visit to Ponthieu in April 1280 by Otho de Grandison and John de Vescy 'to take order with the debts of the land' (33). The third letter from Falvy tries to blame the bulk of the debts on purchases of land by Jeanne and Falvy. The seneschal of Ponthieu, Falvy complained, was refusing to allow him to enter some 120 *li.* worth of those purchases, and was withholding all but a mere pittance of the yearly allowance Edward had promised Falvy for life. Falvy may have been a poor money manager, but he clearly knew the lay of the land and ended this letter with an appeal to Edward's sense of honor, and an unmistakable warning: 'For know, sire, that I should not desire nor intend to speak to anyone other than yourself about a thing that concerns you.'<sup>103</sup>

Clearly, the threat of King Philip's involvement still hung over the whole affair, and by the summer of 1280 it appeared to Edward's frantic proctors at Paris that Falvy's direst warnings were about to be realized: the seneschal of Ponthieu had exhausted every possibility, consultations with the creditors had failed, and payment by instalments had been peremptorily refused. The proctors, who included Geoffrey de Geneville (32), hastily wrote to the king that 'it will not be much longer before the men of the king of France cause the debts to be levied, unless counsel be quickly taken.' Geoffrey and his associates had turned up a monk of Fécamp who was well disposed towards Edward, and who was willing to promise a loan from his abbot of 1000 *li.* of Paris, to be repaid out of the revenues of Ponthieu over three years. The proctors urged the king to accept this expedient quickly in order to tide matters over until the end of the present *Parlement*, after which other measures could be adopted.<sup>104</sup> This letter was sent from Paris on 4 July, at about the same time arrangements were concluded with some burgesses in Ponthieu for loans amounting to some 2440 *li.* of Paris to pay what was owed the lord of Estrées, the loans to be repaid by allowing the creditors to farm *vicomtés* in Ponthieu for three years.<sup>105</sup> The arrangement with the abbot of Fécamp, suggested by the proctors in July, was finalized on 20 August 1280, when the king and queen promised that in keeping with an agreement already concluded with the

<sup>102</sup> P.R.O. S.C. 1/17/49, undated, but with an explicit reference to the fact that Edward has already agreed to assume the debts, and thus subsequent to July 1279.

<sup>103</sup> P.R.O. S.C. 1/17/50, undated.

<sup>104</sup> P.R.O. S.C. 1/16/78, dated Paris, St. Martin's day in summer (4 July). The agreement with the abbot of Fécamp in the following month means the year must be 1280. There is a defective text of this letter in Bréquigny and Champollion-Figéac, *Lettres*, no. 202.

<sup>105</sup> *CPR 1272-1281*, pp. 388-89.

abbot by their seneschal, they would repay the abbot 4000 *li.* of Paris over a period of four years.<sup>106</sup> Obviously, Jeanne's debts had been considerable, and even these new loans did not suffice to clear them. As late as May 1282, the abbot of Fécamp came up with another 3000 *li.*, and in the same month the king and queen acknowledged loans from other burgesses in Ponthieu amounting to 2359 *li.* of Paris.<sup>107</sup>

In the matter of the debts with which Jeanne's inheritance was burdened, the English king and queen were clearly as anxious to avoid intervention by the French king as they appear to have been willing to invite Philip's attention to the question of the succession itself. After so much difficulty over the debts, Edward and Eleanor were naturally eager to get at least some return for the money they had spent to keep the business out of King Philip's hands, and over a period of some years they gradually bought from John de Falvy the problematical purchases of land he had made with Queen Jeanne. By August 1289, Falvy was left with only a yearly income from the receiver of Ponthieu amounting to 314 *li.* 6 *s.* of Paris, with half that sum yearly to remain to his heirs forever.<sup>108</sup>

The schedule of December 1280, the sole surviving document produced by the initial examination of Ponthevin finances under Edward I and Eleanor of Castile, can in a sense be seen as a little guide to Edward's statecraft, reflecting as it does a wide variety of administrative problems and methods during a critical period of transition and assimilation as the new English count and countess established their control in Ponthieu. There was, of course, a real element of luck involved, as the administrative system they inherited had preserved the competence of central authority in the county. The English king and queen, accustomed to preside over a highly sophisticated centralized administration, were able to make effective use of the system they now inherited to pursue what Johnstone called a policy of definition and exaction, whose general direction was not dissimilar to that which Edward followed in England.<sup>109</sup>

<sup>106</sup> *ibid.*, p. 395.

<sup>107</sup> *CPR 1281-1292*, p. 21. Johnstone, 'The County of Ponthieu', 446, suggested that this batch of loans was intended to assist the king during the Welsh wars, but given the recent new loan from Fécamp, Falvy's debts seem a more likely explanation. The haste with which loans were contracted to supply cash to repay the debts contrasts with the slow pace at which the settlement with the queen's nephew was paid (above, n. 91).

<sup>108</sup> *CPR 1281-1292*, p. 6, *RG* 3.5058, 5065, and Prarond, *Cartulaire*, pp. 323-24, 337 (= Paris, BN lat. 10112, fol. 303v), all concern a single mill at Le Crottoy which appears to have been of Falvy's own inheritance, not a purchase made with Jeanne. Falvy's share of the purchases made during Jeanne's lifetime began to be conveyed to the king and queen only from March 1285 (*RG* 3.5064, a single transaction involving many properties). This suggests that John de Ponthieu had renounced his claims on these purchases as part of the compromise that settled the dispute over Jeanne's inheritance in 1284 (above, n. 92). The final agreements with Falvy in the summer of 1289 are Paris, AN J 235, no. 49 and J 236, no. 55.

<sup>109</sup> Johnstone, 'The County of Ponthieu', 444.

The success Edward and Eleanor enjoyed in Ponthieu was due not only to the energy and direction with which the administration there came to be informed. There must also be taken into account the effects of the intangible aura of majesty that came to suffuse the new count's authority in Ponthieu. This is, perhaps, most subtly seen in the relations between the new count and countess and the Ponthevin nobility, especially at a time when the fortunes of the Picard gentry were subject to fluctuation, and the impressive financial resources of the English king and queen could have made royal favor an irresistible lure. Just possibly, too, Queen Eleanor's literary endeavors had a deeper resonance than appears at first glance; the Ponthevin nobles at this period were by no means impervious to literary influence. Eleanor's cousin, the count of Eu, likewise sponsored vernacular translations, and the lord of la Ferté (who later allied himself to the queen's family by marriage) boasted an extensive library.<sup>110</sup> It is to be regretted that the new romance she ordered in 1280 has not survived. Its circulation in Ponthieu might have done much to cultivate the image of Isembart as a literary type for the counts of Ponthieu, the same sort of thing Eleanor appears to have done in England by encouraging Arthurian interest at court.<sup>111</sup>

The townsmen of Ponthieu had not at first reacted well to the king's early refusal, as an anointed monarch, to swear personally the oaths required of him when he and the queen first took possession of the county in 1279. Edward and Eleanor had to issue letters promising that, so long as they were not also anointed sovereigns, future counts and countesses of Ponthieu would swear the oaths in person.<sup>112</sup> But the ceremonial knightng of the unpopular Hugh de Famechon at Abbeville in 1280 indicates that while the men of Ponthieu wanted only a count

<sup>110</sup> R. H. Lucas, 'Mediaeval French Translations of the Latin Classics to 1500', *Speculum* 45 (1970) 248-50; U. Robert, ed., *L'Art de chevalerie. Traduction du 'De re militari' de Végèce par Jean de Meun* (Paris, 1897). It is uncertain what influence Eleanor might have had on the translation of Vegetius her cousin Count John of Eu caused John de Meung to prepare in 1284, about thirteen years after Eleanor had it translated for Edward.

On the inventory of the la Ferté library see Ch. de Beaurepaire, 'Bibliothèque du château de la Ferté en Ponthieu au xiv<sup>e</sup> siècle', *BEC* 13 (1851-52) 559-62. The editor made no attempt to date the inventory, but one entry at p. 562 shows that a copy of Latini's *Livre du Trésor* had been lent to 'Messire Jehan de Pink' que diex assoille'. This must refer to Eleanor's kinsman John de Picquigny (d. 1302), whose daughter Margaret married Matthew de Roye, lord of la Ferté, in 1291; the inventory presumably dates from not long after John de Picquigny's death. See: F. I. Darsy, *Picquigny et ses seigneurs, vidames d'Amiens* (Abbeville, 1860), pp. 753-55; Parsons, *Court and Household*, pp. 50-52; Anselme, *Histoire généalogique* 8.7-15.

<sup>111</sup> N. Denholm-Young, *History and Heraldry, 1254 to 1310. A Study of the Historical Value of the Rolls of Arms* (Oxford, 1965), p. 47; Parsons, *Court and Household*, p. 14. I dealt with this aspect of Eleanor's literary patronage in a paper read to the seventeenth annual medieval workshop at the University of British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C., in November 1987; my extended article on the subject is in preparation.

<sup>112</sup> RG 3.5015, 5020-27.

and countess, Edward and Eleanor were determined to remain king and queen as well. The fact that virtually all the confrontations between the English sovereigns and the towns of Ponthieu were ultimately settled either by capitulation to the king and queen, or at least by advantageous compromise, leads to the conclusion that Edward's approach was successful by his own standards if not the Ponthevins'.<sup>113</sup> The extent to which this might have been due to another of the intangibles, the human resources a king and queen could command in the way of skilled advisors such as the younger Accursi, cannot readily be judged although it must have been a significant factor. The wealth of the English king and queen must be mentioned again as an important contribution to their administrative methods in Ponthieu: the county's revenues were in no sense vital to English finances, and could be assigned to repay the loans contracted under necessity, to pay Jeanne's debts and the large settlement agreed upon with John de Ponthieu. At the same time, the king and queen were able to send considerable sums of money from England to Ponthieu to purchase land there, in order to restore losses from the comital domain earlier in the century.

If Edward wished to appear to his Ponthevin subjects as a king who incidentally happened to be their count, he had no choice but to stand before the king of France as a count who was by chance a king. This delicate relationship nonetheless appears to have been of some value to English administration in Ponthieu, at least during the lifetime of Philip III. Certainly one king could understand how a brother sovereign might complain of a politically meddlesome bishop, and both as cousin and fellow-king Edward would appreciate the dangers of allowing Philip any opportunity to involve himself in Ponthevin affairs, beyond such matters as properly belonged in the legal forum. This awareness dictated caution and prudence, and the information to be derived from an all-but-forgotten schedule sent to England in 1280 demonstrates that those qualities were not lacking as Edward I and Eleanor of Castile assumed control of the county of Ponthieu.

<sup>113</sup> Johnstone, 'The County of Ponthieu', 446.

## APPENDIX

London, P.R.O., Chancery *Liberate* Roll 9 Edward I: C 62/57, schedule to m. 8.<sup>1</sup> (Crown copyright material appears by permission of the Controller of H. M. Stationery Office).

- (1) Ce sont les choses emvoiees a ma dame la Reine dengleterre de quoi il receuerres requiert alouance.
- (2) Pour .ij. hanas de mazre, e pour .ij. Coupes a Couuercler achatees a paris par le Seneschal, par la letre de Creance que henris de la mote<sup>2</sup> aporta, e pour autres choses petites contenues v dos de la dite litre de Creance par son commandament par Guillot du uergier.<sup>3</sup> .xij.li.
- (3) Item pour .xij. chapiteus dargent que ma dame commanda fere pour metre a ses liurez par la letre de creance le dit henris emvoies en Engleterre. .xxij.s.
- (4) Item pour .vj. pelicons de Conils, e pour .ij. blanches pennes achatees [a paris] par le commandament ma dame par le desus dite letre de Creance achatees par henri de la mote a Willaume de Fescamp peletier, e portees en Engleterre par dant Renaut.<sup>4</sup> .iiij.li. xij.s. ij.d.
- (5) Item pour .vij. dozenes de formages de brie achatez a paris par Jehan le Clerc du commandament ma dame par la dite letre de creance. .lvij.s. viij.d.
- (6) Au despens celui Jehan alant a Paris pour achater ceus formages, e pour querre j. rubi entaillie envoie a ma dame. .xxj.s.
- (7) Item pour les coustages que cil fourmage cousterent a mener de Paris de ci a Cressi<sup>5</sup> la ou il furent charchie pour mener en Engleterre. .vj.s.

(1)-(7) enclosed with bracket at left, marked 'par letre' in margin; a new hand adds 'allocate' below 'par letre'.

(4) words in brackets expunged.

<sup>1</sup> Spelling and word division have not been altered. Punctuation has been standardized. Each entry has been assigned a serial number for ease of reference.

<sup>2</sup> Henry 'de la Mote' was left 10 li. by the queen's mother (Brunel, *Recueil*, no. 466). Proctor for the king and queen in all courts in France, and to demand money fee from the count of Flanders, May 1282 (*CPR 1281-1292*, pp. 20-21). Proctor to France against John de Ponthieu, July 1283 (*RG 3.5056*). Supervisor of the king's works in Ponthieu, November 1283, October 1285 (*ibid.* 3.5059, 5078).

<sup>3</sup> Appointed to do homage for the queen to the count of Flanders for fee she holds of him, August 1280 (London, British Library Add. Charter 8129; *CPR 1272-1281*, p. 395); cf. 56, where he is going to 'the plea of Flanders'. Again responsible for purchases in Ponthieu, November 1283 (*RG 3.5060*). Queen's valet, leaves court for the Holy Land, June 1290, when he receives £ 20 of king's gift (P.R.O. roll of king's money gifts 18 Edward I, E 101/352/21, m. 3).

<sup>4</sup> Renaud or Reginald, monk of Forest-Montiers, prominent in Anglo-Ponthevian affairs throughout early 1280s; well-regarded by the king and queen who provided for his maintenance (*CPR 1272-1281*, pp. 388-419; *CPR 1281-1292*, p. 21; *RG 3.5047*, 5053). See also above, p. 381.

<sup>5</sup> Crécy (Somme).

- (8) pour .ij. oisiaus que Raoules<sup>6</sup> valles ma dame achata a son oes par letre de Creance queus il porta En Engleterre avec les fourmages du Gart.<sup>7</sup> .xx.s.  
 (9) Item pour voirres achates par la letre de Creance que Raoules aporta. .xx.s.  
 (10) A .j. vallet portant ces voirres, de ci a Wissant.<sup>8</sup> .iiij.s.  
 (11) Item a Raoulet pour aides que li aiderent apporter les menues choses quil achata a Abeuile<sup>9</sup> de ci au gard. .ij.s.j.d.  
 (12) Item au dit Raoulet retournant en Engleterre menant ces choses [en Engleterre] pour son despens. .Lx.s.  
 (13) Pour pomes du blanc durel, e pour entes du blanc durel envoies alanguelee,<sup>10</sup> e pour poires par le command ma dame par letres. .xlviij.s.vij.d.  
 (14) A .j. vallet menant ce fruit e ces entes dabeuile a Cressi. .iiij.s.vj.d.  
 (15) A blondel le messagier menant ce fruit e ces entes alondres eles fourmages pour son despens de .xiiij. Jours. .xxv.s.  
 (16) Pour .v. aunes [et dimie] de Toile grosse a Courir ce fruit. .iiij.s.ij.d.  
 (17) Pour un roman de Isembart achate du Commandement ma dame. .xx.s.  
 (18) Item pour cest roman que len fist escrire de nouel, e pour le enluminer, e pour le lier. .xxxviij.s.v.d.  
 (19) Pour .ij. faucons envoies a ma dame En Engleterre par Guillot. .iiij.li.  
 (20) Item pour .j. faucon baille a Guillot pour porter en Engleterre, le quel me sire Amis de Savoie<sup>11</sup> eut. .xl.s.  
 (21) Pour les despens de ces faucons en Engelines. .ij.s.  
 (22) Pour .j. autre faucon qui morut en la garde de Jehan de vileroie<sup>12</sup> auant quom le peust porter en Engleterre. .xxx.s.

(8)-(12) enclosed with bracket at left, marked 'par letre' in margin; a new hand adds 'allocate' below. Similarly (13)-(16), (17)-(18), (19)-(22).

(12) words in brackets expunged.

(16) words in brackets interlineated.

<sup>6</sup> The queen's mother left 60 s. to 'Raoulet de ma cambre', June 1276 (Brunel, *Recueil*, no. 466). Eleanor's wardrobe roll, 17 Edward I, shows in February 1289 a gift of 6s. 8d. to 'cuidam Raouletto qui quondam stetit cum matre Regine' (P.R.O. E 101/352/13, m. 1). The queen's wardrobe book, 18 Edward I, mentions him again as 'Raoulettus de camera' (Parsons, *Court and Household*, p. 106).

<sup>7</sup> Le Gard (Somme).

<sup>8</sup> Wissant (Pas-de-Calais).

<sup>9</sup> Abbeville (Somme), principal town of the county.

<sup>10</sup> Langley (Herts.), where Eleanor purchased in 1275 the manor later known as King's Langley (CCIR 1279-1288, pp. 80-81; Palgrave, *Antient Kalendars* 1.58). She appears to have attached some importance to the gardens there (Parsons, *Court and Household*, p. 104).

<sup>11</sup> Edward's kinsman Amadeus, who succeeded as count of Savoy, 1285, and died 1323 (Isenburg-Büdingen, *Stammtafeln* 2.111-12).

<sup>12</sup> Lord of Villeroy (Somme); esquire, confirmed sale of land by his sister and her husband to mayor and *échevins* of Villeroy, July 1278 (Prarond, *Cartulaire*, pp. 180-81 [= Paris, BN lat. 10112, fol. 226r]). Proctor for the king and queen against John de Ponthieu, December 1281 (CPR 1281-1292, p. 6). Witnessed restoration of fief of Drucat to its lord from whom previously confiscated, August 1289 (Prarond, *ibid.*, p. 338 [= Paris, BN lat. 10112, fol. 118v]).



- (23) Pour .xl. los doile doliete envoies envoies en Engleterre par le commandement ma dame par letres. .Lijj.s. iijj.d.
- (24) Pour .j. tonel dont len fist barrius la ou hon mist cel Oile. .ijj.s.
- (25) Pour le faiture de ces barrius. .ijj.s.
- (26) Pour .j. bast a metre sour le cheual qui mena cel Oile. .ij.s. x. d.
- (27) Pour cil bast retourner e pour .ij. [cengles]. .Xijj.d.
- (28) Pour a corder alier e atourner ces barrius. [.x. d.]
- (29) Pour .xvij. res de Oingnons enuoies en Engleterre achate du commandement ma dame par letres. .iiij.s.
- (30) Pour .j. sac la ou hon le mist. .xvj.d.
- (31) Pour le despens de .j. vallet menant cele Oile en Engleterre e les oingnons, e pour le loyer dun cheual qui les porta. .Lxxij.s. iijj.d.
- (32) Pour le despens Sire Jeffrei de Gienvile, sa feme,<sup>13</sup> [e sa] mesnie par .j. Jour a Cressi e par vne nuit, aportant la letre ma dame. .ix. li. v. s.
- (33) Pour le despens Sire Otho de Gransson<sup>14</sup> venant a abeuile par vne fois pour parler ou le Euesque damiens<sup>15</sup> v tens que il e me sire Johan de Vesci<sup>16</sup> furent en Pontiu pour ordener de les detes aquiter de la terre. .iiij. li. xij. s.
- (34) Pour le despens sire Otho e sire Johan de Vesci a ce meisme tens en Pontiu, pour la besoingne de Pontiu de sus dite demorant au Gart par .ijj. semaines. .xix. li. xi. s. x. d.
- (35) Les queus li receueour troua pour son aconté que la gent sire Othe auoient tout paie, fors. .iiij. li. e .vijj. s.
- (36) Pour vne pipe de vin e les cous' .... [.Lxij.s. vj. d.]

(23)-(31) enclosed in bracket at left, marked 'par letre'; a new hand adds 'allocate'. Similarly (32)-(39).

(23)-(31) in all instances, 'i' in 'Oile' is over an erasure; the preceding 'cel' has been altered by erasure from 'cele' save in (31). In (31) the 'i' in 'Oile' is dotted twice.

(27), (28), (32) words in brackets over erasures.

(36) line unfinished; sum struck out.

(32)-(39) enclosed in bracket at left, marked 'par letre'; in this instance there is no added 'allocate'.

<sup>13</sup> Geoffrey de Joinville or Geneville (d. 1314), half brother of the biographer of Louis IX of France. Probably brought to England by Savoy kin, he married c. 1252 Maud de Lacy, heiress of the Irish lands of that family. This couple were preparing for an extended residence on the Continent, February 1280 (*CPR 1272-1281*, p. 364), and Geoffrey was one of Edward's proctors at Paris the following summer (above, p. 393): G.E.C. 5.628-31; G. W. Watson, 'The Families of Lacy, Geneva, Joinville and La Marche', *The Genealogist* N. S. 5 (1905) 1-16, 73-82, 163-72, 234-43.

<sup>14</sup> Otho de Grandison, another royal kinsman through the Savoyards (G.E.C. 6.69-73; C. L. Kingsford, 'Sir Otho de Grandison, 1238?-1328', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 3rd Ser., 3 [1909] 125-95).

<sup>15</sup> William, from Mâcon, bishop of Amiens 1278-1308 (B. Gams, *Series episcoporum ecclesiae catholicae*, 2nd edition [Leipzig, 1885], p. 487).

<sup>16</sup> John de Vescy, prominent English baron, intimate and valued friend of the king and queen (G.E.C. 12.ii, 268-75; Parsons, *Court and Household*, pp. 46-48).

- (37) Pour leur despens fet au Crotoi<sup>17</sup> le Jousdi prochain deuant Lapasque en lan .Lxxix. .Lxij.s.vj.d.  
 (38) Pour aueine que len leur troua au Gart auoec leur Cheuaus. .C.xv.s.  
 (39) Pour aueine menee au Gart pour leur Cheuaus prise a Johan lengleis. .Lx.s.  
 (40) Pour la cheualerie Sire Hue de faumechon<sup>18</sup> le quele ma dame manda par letre, e par sire Johan de Greli<sup>19</sup> com le feist fere cheualier. .Lj.li.xvj.s.  
 (41) Si com il apiert es parces de la conte le recevoir.  
 (42) Item pour le Pallefrei que li dis sire Hues ot quant il fu fet cheualiers. .xvij.li.x.s.  
 (43) E de ceste cheualerie parla li Seneschal a nostre seingnour le roi, e il respondi que il voloit que tout fust aloe.  
 (44) Pour .xxv. moutons envoiees en Engleterre du commandement ma dame par letres.<sup>20</sup> .ix.li.xvij.s.vj.d.  
 (45) Pour le loier dun vallet qui mena ces moutons dabeuile deci a la mer. .xvj.s.  
 (46) Pour pomes de blandurel par la letre ma dame envoiees en Engleterre. .xxxij.s.vj.d.  
 (47) Pour .j. vallet menant ces pomes en Engleterre. .xvj.s.  
 (48) Pour le sostenance Constance lespaingnole du commandement ma dame par letre. .vj.li.  
 (49) Summa par lettres. .CLxvij.li.v.s.x.d.  
 (50) As freres menuz dabeuile de la grace nostre seingnour le roi noncie par dant Renaut repairant dengleterre. .vj.li.x.s.

- (40)-(43) enclosed in bracket at left, with note 'par letre'; there is no added 'allocate'. (40) and (41) are linked to the first sum by a bracket at right; likewise (42) and (43) to the second sum. (44)-(47) enclosed by bracket at left, marked 'par letre'; there is no added 'allocate'. (48) marked 'par letre' in margin; a new hand adds 'allocate'.

<sup>17</sup> Le Crotoy (Somme).

<sup>18</sup> Probably from Famechon (Somme). A Pierre de 'Famochu' was among envoys treating for Henry III's marriage to Jeanne de Dammartin, 1235 (Rymer, *Foedera* 1.216). A Bernard de Faumuchon was one of the Ponthevin knights who performed military service owed the French king, 1283 (Paris, BN Grenier 298, no. 51a), and witnessed a concord between the lady of Fontaines and the men of that vill during the seneschalcy of Thomas de Sandwyz, 1279-88 (Paris, BN lat. 10112, fol. 80r, inadequately calendared by Prarond, *Cartulaire*, p. 292, but a full text in Thierry, *Recueil* 4.765). For other members of the family see above, p. 384. Hugh was probably knighted c. August 1280, when granted a yearly money fee (*CPR 1272-1281*, p. 394). He later served in England during the Welsh campaign, 1282-83; among the knights of the queen's household, 1285-86 (Johnstone, 'The County of Ponthieu', 445 and n. 56, and B. F. and C. R. Byerley, eds., *Records of the Wardrobe and Household, 1285-1286* [London, 1977], nos. 998, 1105, 1722, 1725).

<sup>19</sup> John de Grailly (from Grilly, in Savoy), active in Edward's service before 1261; seneschal of Gascony 1278, d. 1301. There is a good résumé of his career in *RG 3*.xxxiii-xxvii, which is, however, unaware of this mission in Ponthieu in 1280, probably beginning in July (*CPR 1272-1281*, p. 387). Grailly had earlier profited from Eleanor's patronage in Gascony (*CPR 1272-1281*, pp. 106, 156; *RG 2*.189-90).

<sup>20</sup> This is the only substantive evidence for the popular legend that Eleanor of Castile introduced the Spanish Merino sheep into England; cf. the statement in 'Opus chronicorum', in *Chronica monasterii sancti Albani*, ed. H. T. Riley, 3 (RS 28; London, 1866), pp. 37-38, that a murrain of sheep resulted from the arrival of an ailing Spanish sheep brought into Northumbria by a French magnate.

- (51) Pour le despens de .ij. Courssiers venanz despaingne, alanz en Engleterre, e pour le despens dun vallet qui les garda a abeuile en la maison Gobert mestre de la monoie<sup>21</sup> par .v. semaines, les queus Courssiers Gonçaluo Martinez<sup>22</sup> amena. .C.s.
- (52) Pour le despens de .ij. valles menanz les Courssiers en Engleterre a nostre seingnour Le roi. .Lxxiiij.s. iij.d.
- (53) A Guillot du vergier venant en Pontiff v message nostre seingnour Le roi pour le loier dun Cheual de Waben<sup>23</sup> qui tint en lostel le seneschal par .vj. semaines..Lx.s.
- (54) Item au dit Guillot a vne uoie qui vint a leschequier de Roem<sup>24</sup> pour son retourner En Engleterre. .xliij.s. iiij.d.
- (55) Item a celui Guillot pour son retourner du parlement de la touz seins alant en engleterre. .iiij.li. xv.d.
- (56) Item a celui Guillot alant au plet de Flandres. .vj.li.
- (57) Pour le despens Sire Henri de Gransson<sup>25</sup> e Sire Franceis<sup>26</sup> demorant par une nuit au Gart quant il vindrent en Pontiff pour le plet Johan de Pontiff. .Lij.s.
- (58) Pour .iiij. toniaus de vin de la rochele<sup>27</sup> envoies en Engleterre par le commandement ma dame par Guillot du vergier. .xlvj.li. xvij.s. vj.d.
- (59) Pour carriages e pour le fret de la Neff qui ces vins mena en Engleterre. .vij.li.

(51), (59) 'allocate' added in left margin.

(55) entire entry interlineated.

<sup>21</sup> Gobert André was confirmed as the moneyer of Ponthieu by the king and queen in May 1279, to serve them as he had served her mother (*RG* 3.5030).

<sup>22</sup> Queen's clerk, he appears often from this date, always in conjunction with Castilian business (Byerley, *Records*, nos. 845-46, 2078). In November 1289 he dealt with Castilian merchants who had arrived at Portsmouth, and purchased for the queen various kinds of fruit and colored earthenware jars (P.R.O. Controller's book of the king's wardrobe 18 Edward 1, C 47/4/5, fol. 2r).

<sup>23</sup> Waben (Pas-de-Calais).

<sup>24</sup> Rouen (Seine-Maritime). Du Vergier's journey there may have been connected with gathering evidence for the dispute over Aumâle.

<sup>25</sup> Otho de Grandison did have a brother Henry, but he became bishop of Verdun in 1278 succeeding another brother, Gerard (Kingsford, 'Otho de Grandison', 184). Since the 'plea of John de Ponthieu' could not have arisen before the spring of 1279, this Henry cannot be the same man, but none of the authorities cited above (text note 14, including Kingsford's exhaustive list of Otho's relatives) indicates another Henry de Grandison among Otho's immediate kinfolk. Just possibly the clerk has applied the name Grandison to one of Otho's sisters' sons from the families of d'Estavayer, de Strättingen, or d'Orons.

<sup>26</sup> Almost certainly Edward's *secretarius* the younger Francesco Accursi, who must not be confused with his more famous father of the same name. Some expenses for him, included in the enrolled account of the king's wardrobe on the Pipe Roll for 5 Edward 1, make it seem likely that he joined Edward's service while the king was travelling northwards through Italy on his return from Palestine in 1273 (P.R.O. E 372/121, m. 22a). He represented the king at Paris on Gascon affairs in 1275 (*CPR* 1272-1281, pp. 79, 94, 177), and drew a yearly fee of £ 100 (*ibid.*, p. 299). His journey to Paris on the business of John de Ponthieu was presumably for the *Parlement* at Pentecost 1280 (Beugnet, *Les Olim* 2.160). See also P. Colliva, 'Documenti per la biografia di Accursio' in *Atti del Convegno internazionale di studi accursiani (Bologna 21-26 ottobre 1963)*, ed. G. Rossi, 3 vols. (Milan, 1968), 2.383-458, especially 400-401.

<sup>27</sup> La Rochelle (Charente-Maritime); see text note 29.

- (60) A Felippe popiot<sup>28</sup> alant en Flandres pour Faucons achater aloes ma dame pour son despens. .viiij.li.
- (61) A Thomas le barbier alant auoques Felippe portant en Engleterre faucons quil achata en Flandres. .xl.s.
- (62) Pour .iiij. pipes de Cerise fetes par le commandement ma dame par Guillot du vergier dont les .ij. sont a Cressi en cores, e la tierce envoie en Engleterre. .xxj.li.ij.d.
- (63) Pour pomes, poires, e fourmages envoies en Engleterre auoec la Cerise du commandement ma dame par Guillot.<sup>29</sup> .xxviiij.s.
- (64) Pour le Carriage du fruit e des fourmages, e pour le despens de ceaus qui les menerent. .iiij.li.xvij.s.
- (65) Pour le voiture de la Charette qui mena la pipe de Cerise desques a Wissant e pour le despens dun vallet. .xxxvij.s.
- (66) Pour le cheual dant Renaut qui affola en alant a Paris au Parlement. .xiiij.li.
- (67) Pour le despens le Seneschal alant En Engleterre Contre lagent dabeuile. .Lxx.li.xvj.s.ij.d.
- (68) demorant par .xxviiij. jours dont il demora .vij. Jours a Wissant avant quil poust passer.
- (69) Summa .CCx.li.xvij.s.vij.d.
- (70) Summa toutale .CCCLxxvij.li.iiij.s.vj.d.
- (71) Ce sont les despens [li] queus li Seneschal a mis en les persones de sus dites pour les besoingnes de Pontiff dont il prie alouance, se avoir les doit par raison. Tout premierement,
- (72) Pour le despens Le Euesque damiens venant a cressi e a abeuile par .ij. foiz pour le content dabeuile. .xxviiij.li.iiij.s.vj.d.
- (73) E ences venues demora par .v. jours li dis Euesques a abeuile, a ses propres coustages.
- (74) Item pour le despens sire Johan de greilli demorant a abeuile le jour com le fist Les cleims et les demandes sour le gent dabeuile .xix.li.xvij.s.ix.d. E fet assauoir que li dis me sire Johans demora a cele voie a abeuile par .iiij. Jours a ses propres coustages. Remembrance du Bailliff damiens. .C. et .xiiij.s.

(60) 'allocate' added in left margin.

(61)-(65) 'allocate' written at left against these entries; for (62), the marginal note reads: 'allouez la tierce'.

(67)-(68) entries linked to the sum by bracket at right.

(70) 'li.' over erasure.

(71) word in brackets interlineated; a word has been struck out between 'mis' and 'en'.

(72)-(73) linked to sum by bracket at right.

(74) entry written as paragraph.

<sup>28</sup> A Ponthevin who had served the queen's mother; his wife Edeline was the *magistrissa* of the queen's daughter Joan (Parsons, *Court and Household*, pp. 38-39).

<sup>29</sup> An undated letter from the king's steward Hugh fitz Otes orders John de Maidenstan and master Richard de Abindone to cause the ship of one Michael de St. Edmund to be loaded with as much cheese as it might carry from Ponthieu and Saintonge, and send it in haste to the king and queen, along with twenty-four tuns of beer (P.R.O. S.C. 1/37/17). Perhaps the goods from Saintonge would have been brought from La Rochelle, like the wine mentioned in 58.

- (75) Item du cheual Johan le Clerc qui tua en alant en Gascoingne besoingner au Roi de France du pris de vij.*li*.  
(76) de rechieff le Seneschal uos prie que uos soueingne de ses gages, li queus sont petit.

## DORSE

- (77) de .ij. pennes de blans de conins ne souvent il mie a ma dame  
(78) presentes a ma dame  
(79) nul rechut  
(80) bartelimeus les fist porter  
(81) nul  
(82) nul car il auoient leur despens du roi.

- (77)-(82) in new hand.  
(77) perhaps refers to (4).  
(79), (81)-(82) 'nul' abbreviated as for 'nihil'.  
(82) perhaps refers to (33)-(39).

## ST. THOMAS AQUINAS AND THE PROFESSION OF ARMS

*Edward A. Synan*

TWO circumstances combine to give St. Thomas Aquinas exceptional value as a witness on issues far removed from his academic achievements. The first of these is the sheer bulk of his literary production, the long list of his certainly authentic works, many of them now available in the superb critical editions of the Leonine Commission. Directed to a thirteenth-century audience, those works are replete with explanations, comparisons, and perspectives, all intended to be intelligible to that readership and thus revelatory of both the author and his readers. The second circumstance is our new access to the content of those works, thanks to the pioneering application of computer technology to their indexing by Roberto Busa.<sup>1</sup>

Here the witness of Aquinas to a number of military realities will be examined. This investigation stems from a preliminary impression that military references in the writings of Aquinas reveal a significant facet of the way in which he saw his world,<sup>2</sup> a hitherto unexamined aspect of the human and cultural matrix within which St. Thomas was born and which, in important ways, he never left.

In modern times military personalities of high rank often have spoken of their role in theological terms. 'Service under arms', wrote General Sir John Hackett, 'has been seen as ... a calling resembling that of the priesthood ... it has strong points of resemblance to ... holy orders.'<sup>3</sup> As the Second World War ended, General Douglas MacArthur proclaimed that preservation of the peace would pose enigmas that transcend politics: 'The problem basically is theological'.<sup>4</sup> The Duke

<sup>1</sup> *Index Thomisticus. Sancti Thomae Aquinatis operum omnium indices et concordantiae ...* electronic IBM automato usus digessit Robertus Busa (Stuttgart, 1974-80), 49 volumes completed by a *Clavis indicis*; on this see the still useful article by a member of the Leonine Commission, A. G. Judy, 'The Index Thomisticus: St. Thomas and IBM', *Listening. Journal of Religion and Culture* 9 (1974) 105-18.

<sup>2</sup> This impression has not been experienced universally; a remark of mine to this effect drew the fire of the authoritative *Rassegna di letteratura tomistica* 14.6 (1981) 13: 'Che S. Tommaso era "firmly established in his own time and place and social class" ... è piuttosto accidentale rispetto al suo pensiero' (an appraisal of my 'Aquinas and His Age' in *Calgary Aquinas Studies*, ed. A. Parel [Toronto, 1978]).

<sup>3</sup> John Hackett, *The Profession of Arms* (New York, 1983), p. 9.

<sup>4</sup> Douglas MacArthur, *Reminiscences* (New York, 1964), p. 276, citing his own words at the ceremonies ending hostilities.

of Wellington was convinced that 'the finger of Providence' had been upon him at Waterloo.<sup>5</sup>

By a kind of compensation, the most eminent voices in the Christian theological tradition, those of Augustine and Aquinas, were raised frequently on military affairs, always knowledgeably and often with a certain sympathy. Despite Augustine's dedication to peace as an ideal on every plane — the elements of nature, animal and human life, the goal that is the world to come<sup>6</sup> — he was capable of speaking out on occasion in favor of wielding 'the sword of war'<sup>7</sup> and he may have gone so far as to say that 'Compared with any Christian' (monks and clerics included) 'the militia ought to be first in morality'.<sup>8</sup>

Aquinas seems not to have matched this encomium of what a soldier ought to be and generally recalls rather Augustine's condemnation of military vices in the lines that precede the one cited. Knighthood was not 'a state of perfection' in the eyes of Brother Thomas. St. Sebastian and St. George had reached a height of perfection to be sure, but in the judgment of Aquinas they had done so as martyrs, not as soldiers.<sup>9</sup> Augustine's duties as bishop of Hippo regius under a Christianized Roman Law compelled him to intervene officially with advice or with theoretical justification in concrete instances of military action; no such compulsion bound Brother Thomas. What is more, although born into a military family (Augustine had no such background) Aquinas was exempt, as friar and priest, from any obligation to join his father and, it seems, all but one of his brothers and half brothers in their profession of arms. He noted explicitly that, far from any obligation to take up arms, the cleric who might do so would lose his protection under Church law from bodily assault, a clerical immunity defended by excommunication of the violator. Such a cleric's offense in becoming a knight would be on a par with the crime of bigamy, he claimed.<sup>10</sup> Nevertheless, despite his

<sup>5</sup> The Duke of Wellington put his point in slightly variant terms, first at supper after the battle ('The hand of Almighty God has been upon me this day') and in a note to Lady Frances Webster the day after ('The finger of Providence was upon me, and I escaped unhurt'); see E. Longford, *Wellington. The Years of the Sword* (New York, 1969), pp. 484 and 490 respectively.

<sup>6</sup> *Confessionum libri 13* 13.9.10; *De civitate dei* 19.13; *Enarrationes in psalmos* 136:1.

<sup>7</sup> *Contra Faustum* 22.74; *Epistolae* 189 and 220.

<sup>8</sup> This line, 'Apud omnem christianum prima honestatis debet esse militia', occurs in a sermon (Sermo 82 [b] [PL 39 1904-1906]), the authenticity of which was questioned by the Louvain editors; it has seemed right to invoke it here because Aquinas cited another section of this sermon (*ST* 2-2.66.8 ad 1); the setting of the statement cited is the tendency of military men to excuse their immorality on the ground that they are not monks or clerics: 'Quid habebam facere, homo saecularis et miles? Numquid monachum sum professus aut clericum?' To this Augustine claimed that Scripture calls every sex, age, and dignity to living well: 'Igitur nemo se excuset publicis actibus, nemo de occupatione militiae conqueratur. Apud omnem ....'

<sup>9</sup> '... Sic enim et Sebastianum dico in statu perfectionis fuisse, et Georgium; nec tamen propter hoc dicemus milites statum perfectionis habere ...' (*De perfectione spiritualis vitae* 27 [Leonine edition 41.B 106, ll. 252-255]).

<sup>10</sup> Sunt autem alii casus septem, in quibus percutiens clericum excommunicationem non incurrit ....

renunciation of a military career for himself, Thomas Aquinas exhibits an intimate familiarity with knighthood and its appurtenances. On them he spoke to his contemporaries as a privileged observer and in so doing has left authoritative data to our historians.

Those historians have examined exhaustively all known evidence that bears on the family of the Saint, evidence it would be nugatory to marshal here.<sup>11</sup> Still, a few general remarks are essential. The Saint's father, Landulf of Aquino, was a knight; the necrology of the abbey on Monte Cassino, of which Landulf had been a benefactor, identified him as *miles*, a term on which Brother Thomas was to make an illuminating comment.<sup>12</sup> Giacomo, a half brother of Thomas, was a clergyman of some distinction, but of his three full brothers, sons of the widowed Landulf's second wife, Theodora, two were certainly military men. Aimo (or Aimone or Haymo) had gone to the Holy Land as a crusader with Frederick II in 1229, had been captured by a Christian warlord and held for ransom on Cyprus. Rinaldo (Reginald) was a knightly troubadour in the service of the same Emperor Frederick II. In the end, Rinaldo was to be executed for treason in connection with the Capaccio assassination plot of 1246 and the Aquino family shifted allegiance from Frederick to the pope. A third full brother, Landulf, who died within the lifetime of Thomas, is hardly known, but it may be assumed safely that he too was a knight. Even the daughters in this family reinforced its immersion in the world of knighthood. One sister of St. Thomas was killed by lightning as an infant and Marotta became an abbess, but Theodora and Maria married counts and an Adelasia, a lady who may well have been a third sister of Thomas, married a husband from the knightly class appropriate for an Aquino. This family background

*Septimo, si transfert se clericus ad actum penitus contrarium, ut si fiat miles, vel ad bigamiam transeat' (In 4 Sent. 18.2.5 in corp. [edd. Mandonnet-Moos, 4.965-66]).*

<sup>11</sup> There are three mediaeval 'lives' of Aquinas, written by three Dominicans between 1274 when Aquinas died and 1323 when he was canonized. Despite the fact that these were written in order to forward his canonization, they are by no means without historical value. The authors, Thomas Calo, O.P., William of Tocco, O.P., and Bernard Gui, O.P. were honorable men and innumerable details were commonly known and so subject to control by the readers. All three, along with other documents associated with the double process of canonization, first at Naples in 1319 and then at Fossanova in 1321, have been given a non-critical, but reliable, edition in supplements to the *Revue thomiste* as *Fontes vitae sancti Thomae Aquinatis: Vitae*, ed. D. Prümmer and *Processus, Documenta, De canonizatione*, ed. M.-H. Laurent (Toulouse-Saint-Maximin, 1911-34). A number of contemporary and near-contemporary sources have also been the object of minute scrutiny by modern specialists, notably, F. Scandone, 'La vita, la famiglia e la patria di S. Tommaso', *San Tommaso d'Aquino O.P., Miscellanea storico-artistica* (Rome, 1924), pp. 1-110 and, on his status as oblate at Monte Cassino, T. Leccisotti, 'Il dottore angelico a Montecassino', *Rivista di filosofia neo-scolastica* 32 (1940) 552; for extended statements of the evidence see V. J. Bourke, *Aquinas' Search for Wisdom* (Milwaukee, 1965), pp. 1-18 and J. A. Weisheipl, *Friar Thomas d'Aquino: His Life, Thought, and Work* (Garden City, N. Y., 1974; revised and corrected edition Washington, D. C., 1983), pp. 1-51.

<sup>12</sup> See below, n. 48.



and the Saint's recurrent exposure to it, are reasons enough for us to expect that Brother Thomas would possess as a matter of course a wide and precise knowledge of military affairs. What follows is an effort to document that expectation.

#### FAMILY AND EDUCATION

Elsewhere<sup>13</sup> I have proposed that a major hardship endured in childhood by Thomas Aquinas was his removal from his family at about the age of five in order to begin his formal education at the monastery of Monte Cassino, then as now a Benedictine house. In contrast to the harshness of so early a separation from his mother and nurses, here the positive educational impact of those first five years or so with his family is relevant. He had come to consciousness of parents and brothers and sisters in a feudal castle. Abundant evidence establishes that he had witnessed his brothers' exercises with their weapons and that he absorbed their discussions of knighthood and its preoccupations. After approximately nine years with the monks on Monte Cassino, two more periods with his family reinforced the impressions of those early years. At fourteen or thereabouts, in the spring of 1239, Thomas returned to his family from Monte Cassino because the emperor had fortified the monastery; only after the summer would Thomas leave home once more, this time to matriculate at the university Frederick had founded in Naples.

After joining the Order of Preachers at Naples Thomas underwent the celebrated ambush and abduction, mounted by his brother Rinaldo from the emperor's camp at Acquapendente where Rinaldo had been serving under arms. His enforced residence of a year or two with his family, first at the castle of Monte San Giovanni and then at Roccasecca where he had been born, was yet another period of exposure for Brother Thomas, this time as a young adult, to the military life which dominated the Aquino clan. In that exposure he hardly saw knighthood at its best and, although his writing may encourage high standards for the military, his realistic evaluations of knights border on cynicism. An important consequence of this state of affairs is that the relative chronology of Thomistic references to our theme is almost never significant for the purposes of this investigation. Most of his military information can be accounted for by first-hand observation during the periods he spent at home.

These facts, however incontrovertible, ought not to be extrapolated beyond the conclusions they can support. In dealing with the profession of arms in his theological work, Brother Thomas was not unique. No Master of the Sacred Page could escape the duty of discourse on military matters. Like the rest, but no more

<sup>13</sup> 'Saint Thomas Aquinas: His Good Life and Hard Times' in *Thomistic Papers III*, ed. L. A. Kennedy (Houston, 1987), pp. 35-53.

than the rest, Thomas Aquinas was bound by biblical texts even more than by secular authors to discuss a range of warlike issues. The assault upon The Land under judges and kings as recounted in the Hebrew Scriptures posed a whole series of enigmas for the exegete, not all of them moral ones. Biblical texts conveyed a battlefield vocabulary that was destined to remain substantially unchanged until gunpowder and mechanization, well after the day of Aquinas, would transform the conditions of war. In the Christian extensions of the Hebrew Bible, resort to John the Baptist by soldiers, the advice they received, the identification of Jesus with non-violence and peace, and references in the Book of Revelation which echo Hebrew prophecies of war and the rumor of war, all put mediaeval exegetes on their mettle in their interpretation of the Bible on war and peace. To historical instances of biblical warfare and warriors must be added the military imagery of the Psalms, of Job, of Peter, and of Paul. Then as now a theologian necessarily considered war and its trappings in scrutinizing the moral obligations of those who wage it. Since other theologians as well commented on such issues, it is essential to recognize that the Common Doctor's military expertise will be established less by the quantity than by the quality of his references to the profession of arms.

On this front, as on so many others, the range of information Aquinas brought to his task is hardly matched by that of any other mediaeval theologian. He seems to have gone beyond his colleagues in at least three ways:

First, St. Thomas was given to making what may be styled a gratuitous use of military illustrations. This can only mean that his mind was freighted with a supply of military lore to which he spontaneously had recourse in setting out his understanding of academic themes. One instance of this marks his explanation of how the tenth 'category' of Aristotle's logic, in Latin translation *habitus*, the state of being clothed or equipped, can be predicated with propriety of irrational animals as well as of humans. Aquinas wrote that it can be so predicated and adduced a horse to illustrate his contention. The horse he described, not only as 'saddled', an obvious and adequate way to make his point, but also as 'caparisoned' or 'armored'; the horse that had come to his mind was the horse of a knight: *equum phaleratum vel sellatum seu armatum*.<sup>14</sup> An equally gratuitous use of a warhorse was invoked to instantiate 'a good consumed in use', a conception which in another context would ground his rationalization of thirteenth-century anti-usury legislation (*Summa theologiae* 2-2.78.1 where silver in the form of coin is 'consumed in use' unlike the same silver in the form of a vessel). Here 'There are many goods that are consumed when we use them: wine when drunk and a horse when exposed to combat'.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>14</sup> *In octo libros Physicorum Aristotelis expositio*, ed. M. Maggiolo (Turin-Rome, 1954), p. 159.

<sup>15</sup> '... multa autem sunt bona quae dum in nostrum usum vertimus consumuntur, sicut vinum dum bibitur, et equus dum exponitur pugnae' (*De perfectione spiritualis vitae* 14 [41.B 85, ll. 43-46]).

Second, Aquinas had read military authors as well as theologians and philosophers. His erudition included texts that a theologian might have been excused had he not read them. As in his speculation generally, Brother Thomas was prepared to buttress the sacred with the profane, even where the profane was military. Vegetius, we shall see, might illumine a controversy within the Church.

Finally, the military allusions by Brother Thomas are marked by a familiarity that stems from his upbringing in a family of knights. His remarks have an air of direct experience. Job 39:23 refers for instance to the rattling of arms (quiver, lance, and buckler) carried by a mounted warrior. In commenting on this verse, Aquinas evokes the exuberance of adolescents training to use weapons, brandishing and clashing together their knightly shields and lances.<sup>16</sup> His text required that he mention what made a quiver noisy: it was 'full of arrows'. And there he dropped the bow and quiver, equipment, not of knights, but of peasant infantry and yeomanry in the mediaeval west.

The ominous presence of warfare as background of political life in the century of St. Thomas cannot be overlooked in accounting for the prevalence of military references in his work. Mongol armies were poised in his youth on the borders of the eastern kingdoms;<sup>17</sup> crusades whether against 'Manicheans'<sup>18</sup> in Europe or against Moslems 'across the sea' preoccupied popes and kings and knights, a situation brought home to St. Thomas with peculiar force by the adventures of his elder brother, Aimo. The times as well as the texts of the theologians generated a mass of commonly circulating military lore.

#### SHIELDS AND BUCKLERS

This mention of 'commonly circulating military lore' is a necessary preliminary; that there was such material in circulation is verified by a striking image, which occurs in two of the Saint's works, but which was not original with him.

<sup>16</sup> '*Super ipsum sonabit pharetra, scilicet plena sagittis, dum concutitur ad motum militis equo insidentis; similiter etiam ex hasta et clipeo militis sonus aliquis procedit, unde subdit vibrabit hasta ... similiter clipeus dum movetur et ad arma colliditur sonum facit, unde subdit et clipeus ...*' (*Expositio super Iob ad litteram* 39:23 [Leonine edition 26.211]); as will be clear, Aquinas was well aware of a number of differences between the military references in the Hebrew Scriptures and parallels in his own day. The 'soldier astride a horse' here he knew was not a 'knight' and his *clipeus* not a knight's shield; still, the picture from biblical antiquity was less alien to him than to a graduate of Saint-Cyr or West Point. He had heard the sounds of riders armed with shields and lances.

<sup>17</sup> For a Dominican record of the way the Mongols were perceived in western Europe, see Vincent of Beauvais, O.P. (c. 1190-1264), *Speculum historiale* 29.69-89 (Douai, 1624), pp. 1209-16.

<sup>18</sup> The Albigensians, 'people of Albi' in Provence, were generally accounted 'Manicheans' by thirteenth-century Churchmen, St. Thomas included; crusading against them by the French monarchy effectively destroyed the movement. It is worthy of note that for St. Dominic Guzman, founder of the Order of Preachers to which Thomas Aquinas belonged, preaching to convert the heretics of Provence had been a primary motive of his foundation, yet by 1223 Pope Gregory IX charged the Inquisition (in the hands of that Order) with completing the eradication of the heresy.

In the early *Scriptum super Sententiis* and in his later exposition of the Epistle to the Galatians, there occurs the image of 'a shield which becomes white'.<sup>19</sup> This shield was introduced to account for the philosophical grammar of the sentence that expresses the Christian dogma of the Incarnation in time of the eternal Word. That the shield of this image 'becomes white' might well puzzle a modern reader, but it is fully compatible with what historians of military equipment have come to know through research on the very limited number of mediaeval shields still in existence. A knight's shield in that period was constructed of strong wooden boards, bound together with metal fittings, and covered with leather. The resultant shield was then strengthened with a coating of glue mixed with chalk.<sup>20</sup> By this step what was a substantively complete shield 'became white' and presented a surface suitable to receive the armorial bearings of the knight who would carry it or, perhaps, the bearings of his feudal lord.

This well-known process as applied to the theological point at issue illustrates the respective roles of the grammatical subject and predicate. The subject 'shield' refers to a real singular, a 'supposit', that functioned as an infinitely diminished analogue of the supposit which is the Word of God. 'White', predicate of the sentence about the shield, although it refers to an accidental 'form', is a remote analogue of the 'form of a slave', *forma servi* (Phil 2:6), the human nature assumed in the fullness of time by the divine Word. Because the shield is first 'constructed', *factum*, and then 'becomes white', it illumines the theological claim that the eternal

<sup>19</sup> '... QUIDAM dicunt quod hoc verbum *incipit*, potest notare inceptionem respectu suppositi simpliciter; et sic est falsa, quia suppositum illud est aeternum; vel respectu suppositi *ratione formae significatae*; et sic est vera, et ponunt exemplum de hac: *Scutum album incipit esse hodie*, supposito quod scutum heri factum hodie dealbetur' (*In 3 Sent.* 12.1.1 in corp. 17 [3.377]); and *Expositio et lectura super epistolas Pauli apostoli, ad Galatas* 4.2 (Parma edition 13.415), where the same illustration is given in equivalent words: '... sicut cum scutum fit album de novo, non oportet dicere quod ipsa substantia scuti de novo fiat, sed quod ei de novo albedo accesserit; ita ex hoc quod Filius Dei de novo carnem assumpsit, non oportet dicere quod persona Christi de novo sit facta; sed quod natura humana ei de novo advenit ....'

<sup>20</sup> See for instance D. Hüpper-Dröge, *Schild und Speer. Waffen und ihre Bezeichnungen im frühen Mittelalter* (Frankfurt am Main-Berne-New York, 1983), p. 209: 'Mit Lat. *scutum* wird der längliche, ursprünglich viereckige, später dann auch ovale hölzerne Langschild bezeichnet, dessen Schildkörper mit Leder überzogen und mit einer metallenen Randeinfassung verstärkt werden konnte. Um die Stabilität des Holzschildes zu erhöhen, wird in der Regel auch ein metallener Schildbuckel angebracht, so dass die Bezeichnung *scutum* mit Sicherheit zahlreiche Schildvarianten umfasst hat'; C. Blair, *European Armour circa 1066 to circa 1700* (London, 1958), p. 181: 'From the beginning of the Middle Ages until the 16th century, the shield seems usually to have been made of wood covered with leather, sometimes reinforced with strips or plates of metal or pieces of horn.' For the 'whitening' of such shields see the magistral entry by H. Nickel, 'Arms and Armor' in *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* 1 (New York, 1982), pp. 521-36; on p. 524 it is noted that '... the earliest known medieval shields are from about 1200 (shield of Arnold von Brienz, Swiss National Museum, Zurich; shield of a prince of Navarre, Real Armeria, Madrid). They are of wood about half an inch thick, covered with thin but tough leather, and painted over a firm foundation of mixed chalk and glue.'

Word preexists the temporal event of Incarnation. Both new and real, whiteness comes to a supposit that endures through this time-bound change. Thus the eternal Word that 'was with God and is God' (Jo 1:1) assumed our nature without ceasing to be divine.

Aquinas certainly learned this analogy from his master, St. Albert the Great.<sup>21</sup> As scion of a knightly family Albert had opportunities comparable with those of Thomas to know intimately and from his own experience the details of a knight's accoutrements. Albert seems to imply that he had borrowed the image from the distinguished theologian, William of Auxerre. In short, despite the exemplary precision of their references to the sequence, first the construction of a shield and its subsequent becoming white, the use of the image by Brother Thomas proves nothing beyond his knowledge of a theological *topos*. Late in his life Aquinas contrived a different image to clarify the theological expression of the same mystery: 'Socrates is first a human, *homo*, and then becomes pale, *albus*.'<sup>22</sup>

Talk of a shield that becomes white is by no means the only evidence of a knowledge of shields that the works of Aquinas proffer. A most notable Thomistic discussion of shields arose from his interpretation of the Book of Job's terrifying sea-beast, Leviathan. In expounding the literal sense of this work, Aquinas identified Leviathan as a whale, intended to represent Satan. Indeed, this identification seems to demonstrate that Brother Thomas knew more about shields than he did about whales for a line of this text (Job 41:6) presented him with a sea-beast to be sure, but with one protected by scales, *squamae*, as whales are not. Those scales could be compared 'as it were to molten shields', *quasi scuta fusilia*, that is to say, they were like shields of cast metal. In his thirteenth-century way Friar Thomas contrasted the metal shields of the biblical text with the wooden ones familiar to his readers (and to himself). Where molten shields 'are indeed continuous', contemporary 'wooden shields are given unity by binding together'<sup>23</sup>

<sup>21</sup> Albert, *In 3 Sent.* 12 A 1 (Borgnet edition 28.221): 'Utrum istae sint verae, Homo factus est Deus, Homo incepit esse Deus, iste homo incepit esse Deus?'; and (p. 222): 'Ratio autem Antisiodorensis est, quod vult quod termini aliter supponunt ex parte subjecti, et aliter ex parte praedicati .... Et ponit instantiam sic, quod scutum illud sit modo dealbatur, haec est vera, Hoc scutum incepit esse album: sed haec est falsa, Hoc album vel album incepit esse scutum: quia cum ly *album* est ex parte praedicati, non dicit nisi albedinem in hoc, sed tamen ex parte subjecti stat pro subjecto alio.'

<sup>22</sup> '... proprie loquendo, haec est vera: Deus factus est homo, sed haec est falsa: Homo factus est Deus. Sicut si Socrates, cum prius fuerit homo, postea factus est albus; demonstrato Socrate, haec est vera: Hic homo hodie factus est albus; haec tamen est falsa: Hoc album hodie factum est homo' (*ST* 3.16.7 ad 4 [Ottawa edition 4.2534b-35a]); also, somewhat earlier, *Super evangelium s. Ioannis lectura* 1.7.1, ed. R. Cai (Turin-Rome, 1952), p. 33: 'Est ergo dicendum contra Eutichem Verbum caro factum est: Verbum carnem assumpsit, non quod ipsum Verbum sit ipsa caro; sicut si dicamus: "Homo factus est albus", non quod ipse sit ipsa albedo, sed quod albedinem assumpsit.'

<sup>23</sup> '... procedit ad dispositionem corporis eius quod describit ad modum piscium habentium squamas ... maximas squamas ad modum scutorum, unde dicit *Corpus eius quasi scuta fusilia*, quae

their relatively fragile and discontinuous components. Leviathan was thus protected by scales as large and as impenetrable as bronze shields. Nothing could penetrate them, neither taken one by one, since each presented a continuous surface, nor could there be any penetration between them, owing to their close arrangement. 'Pressed to each other',<sup>24</sup> the shield-scales of the sea-monster allowed not so much as a breath of air between them (Job 41:7). Surely Leviathan's shield-like scales surpassed the protective value of the non-continuous wooden shields carried by the knights of Aquinas.

It is worth noting that a modern French translation of the Leonine text of Aquinas on Job seems not to have gone beyond the spirit of this formidable defense in translating 'quasi scuta fusilia, quae quidem sunt continua' as: 'comme des boucliers soudées, c'est à dire soudées entre eux.'<sup>25</sup> On the other hand, should we maintain the precedence of the letter over the spirit in interpreting Job, as did Aquinas, the shield-scales of Leviathan could not have been 'welded to each other' for, had that been the case, Leviathan could not have moved, not even to breathe. For once the spirit kills, but the letter grants life. In translating the Latin *scuta* as *boucliers*, however, this French translation had preserved an important distinction, masked by the Latin Aquinas had before him, but clear in the Hebrew. For Hebrew (like Greek and Latin) had distinct terms for what English normally renders as 'shield' and as 'buckler', the first relatively large and rectangular or oblong or kidney-shaped, the second, smaller and usually round, the first made of wood, the second of metal or hardened hide. Here the Hebrew term is *mgn*, equivalent of ὀπίς, *clypeus*, and *bouclier*/buckler.

The notion that Leviathan-Satan was marked by an effective, shieldlike protection had occurred elsewhere in Thomistic exegesis and in a more traditional form. Those passages predate by decades his resolve to depart from the mystical interpretation of the Book of Job, a reading rendered standard by St. Gregory in his *Moralia*.<sup>26</sup>

quidem sunt continua, nam scuta lignea per colligationem adunantur ...' (*Exp. super Iob* 41:6 [26.223, ll. 92-98]).

<sup>24</sup> '... squamae eius non solum sunt magnae sed etiam compressae ad modum piscium multas squamas habentium ... sicut nec squamae Leviathan humana virtute possunt ad invicem disiungi' (ibid., ll. 102-131).

<sup>25</sup> *Saint Thomas d'Aquin. Job un homme pour notre temps*, traduction de J. Kreit (Paris, 1980), p. 563.

<sup>26</sup> 'Intendimus enim compendiose secundum nostram possibilitatem, de divino auxilio fiduciam habentes, librum istum qui intitulatur *Beati Iob* secundum litteralem sensum exponere; eius enim mysteria tam subtiliter et diserte beatus papa Gregorius nobis aperuit ut his nihil ultra addendum videatur' (*Exp. super Iob*, prol. [26.4, ll. 96-102]). This justifiable caution to his reader, however, somewhat veils the priority that Gregory had given to the 'literal sense': '... debemus prius historiae radicem figere ut ualeamus mentem postmodum de allegoriarum fructu satiari' (Gregory, *Moralia in Iob*, praef. 10 [CCL 143.24, ll. 34-36]).

In elucidating the phrase *scutum cordis* which he encountered in the Lamentations of Jeremiah (3:65), possibly and even probably as *cursor biblicus* under Albert at Cologne, Aquinas interpreted those words as meaning that the Lord 'in accord with their sin' gave to sinners 'a shield of the heart, namely, a hardness with the result that they not be penetrated by the arrows of Your grace, in the sword of Your Word'. He there appealed in support of his exegesis to the line we have seen from Job 'His body is, as it were, molten shields'.<sup>27</sup> A parallel use of the Job passage, also an echo of Gregory, is to be found in his exegesis of a clause from Rom 6:6 'That the body of sin be destroyed'. According to Thomas, the body of sin is 'the very collection of evil works, as the very collection of members results in a body, one by nature', for Job had said 'His body is, as it were, molten shields, compacted of scales pressed to each other'.<sup>28</sup> In all three contexts evil — the Leviathan-whale of Job, the sin of those who were opposed and cursed by the Prophet Jeremiah, and the collection of evil doings, equivalent in their perverse unity to that of a natural body in the language of Paul — is covered by shields, the *scuta fusilia* of Leviathan-Satan. Unlike his new direction in the literal exposition of Job, in these early efforts Aquinas adopted the insight of Pope Gregory I that a shield can be, not only a protection against malevolent attack, but also a barrier against the grace of God.<sup>29</sup> It may also be remarked that in these early passages Aquinas did not go beyond the exegesis provided by the *Glossa ordinaria*, a fact that must have significance for the relative dating of his work on Lamentations and on Romans.

All of this is reasonably straightforward, but there is another discussion of shields by St. Thomas which sets a most awkward problem for his reader. In the course of expounding Ps 5:13 *Domine, ut scuto bonae voluntatis tuae coronasti nos* he ventured a startling assertion which must be given its remote context.

First, Brother Thomas assured his readers that 'of old it was the custom of the Romans to use round shields and in those shields they had a hope of victory'.<sup>30</sup>

<sup>27</sup> '... *scutum cordis*; idest, pro peccato eorum retribuēs scutum cordis, scilicet duritiā, ut non penetrentur sagittis gratiae tuae in gladio verbi tui. Job 41: "Corpus illius quasi scuta fusilia"' (*Thren.* 4.22 [Parma edition 14.681]).

<sup>28</sup> 'Deinde cum dicit, *Ut destruat corpus peccati*, ponit effectum praedicti beneficii duplicem; quorum primus est remotio praecedentium delictorum; et hoc est quod dicit: *Ut destruat corpus peccati*: dicitur enim corpus peccati, ipsa congeries malorum operum; sicut ipsa congeries membrorum facit unum corpus naturale. Job 41.6: "Corpus ejus quasi scuta fusilia, compactum squamis se prementibus." Secundus ...' (*In Rom.* 6.2 [13.61]).

<sup>29</sup> Gregory, *Moralia* 33.28 (CCL 143B.1716, ll. 1-12): '*Corpus illius quasi scuta fusilia*. Scriptura sacra scuti nomine aliquando uti in parte prospera, aliquando in aduersa consuevit. Nam saepe scuti defensio pro diuina protectione ponitur; nonnumquam uero pro humana repugnatione memoratur. Pro diuina enim protectione per psalmistam dicitur: *Scuto bonae uoluntatis tuae coronasti nos* .... Rursum pro humana repugnatione per eundem prophetam scutum ponitur sicut ait: *Ibi confregit cornua, arcum, scutum, gladium et bellum* ... obstinata duritia ....'

<sup>30</sup> 'Consuetudo namque fuit Romanis antiquitus uti scutis rotundis, et in illis habebant spem

This unexceptionable statement may reflect his reading of one or two passages in Livy that support both claims: 'Earlier, the Romans used bucklers, *clipeis*; then, after they became salaried, they made shields, *scuta*'.<sup>31</sup> This testimony to a Roman shift from the buckler to the shield is reinforced, along with the implication of a Roman hope of victory in the larger *scutum* and its superior protection, by another text in which Livy contrasted the equipment of the soldiers of Alexander with the armament of the Romans. 'Their <that is, 'the Greeks'> arms were bucklers, *clipei*, and pikes; for the Romans, a shield, *scutum*, a greater protection for the body'.<sup>32</sup>

Acquaintance with these lines from Livy, an author Aquinas occasionally quoted explicitly,<sup>33</sup> would account for his conviction that Romans had first used the smaller, round buckler and later the larger, 'door-like'<sup>34</sup> shield. The texts of Livy, however, hardly explain the remark of Aquinas that, while still using the round buckler in warfare, the Romans 'used that same round shield as a crown'.<sup>35</sup> Furthermore, the language of Aquinas suggests that he was not at ease with the distinction between the technical terms *clipeus* and *scutum*, this last the Greek *θυρεός* and the Hebrew *šnnh*, though he evidently knew the objects named. He felt free, therefore, to speak of 'round shields', *scuta rotunda*, instead of 'bucklers', *clypei*, and to assert that such a 'round shield' might be, not only a means through which victory might be hoped for, but also a sign of victory won. The alleged use by the Romans of their bucklers as crowns Thomas likened to the halo in Christian paintings of the saints: 'Hence the saints are painted with a round shield on the head', for, as the line of Ps 5 had set out, the Lord's 'good will defends us here and crowns us there'.<sup>36</sup> The same divine power is on earth a protection, a shield, and a crown in the world to come.

Art historians have another explanation for the halo. Hellenistic art gave gods and heroes the nimbus; Christian artists followed their convention with haloes, round for the heroic dead, square for the eminent living. Unknown to historians

victoriae; et quando triumphabant, illomet scuto utebantur ut corona' (*In ps* 5:9 [Parma edition 14.163]).

<sup>31</sup> 'Clipeis antea Romani usi sunt; dein, postquam stipendarii facti sunt, scuta pro clipeis fecere ...' (Livy, *Ab urbe condita* 8.8.3).

<sup>32</sup> 'Arma clipei essent illis sarisaeque: Romano scutum, maius corpori tegumentum ...' (ibid. 9.19.7).

<sup>33</sup> e.g., *De malo* 9.1 in corp., *ST* 2-2.82.1 in corp. and 2-2.132.1 in corp.

<sup>34</sup> 'Scutum ... wird gleich *οὔτρος* ... bezeichnet im Gegensatz zu *clipeus* ... den bis auf die Füße reichenden, gute Deckung gewährenden hölzernen Lang- oder Türschild (*θυρεός*) der Römer ...' (Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. 'scutum'); it is to be noted that the connection with 'door' is such that the word used in Greek for *scutum* serves also for a stone to keep a door, *θύρα*, open.

<sup>35</sup> 'Et inde sancti pinguntur cum scuto rotundo in capite: quia de hostibus adepti triumphum, scutum rotundum ad instar Romanorum gerunt in capite pro corona' (see above, n. 30).

<sup>36</sup> 'Dicit ergo: *Scuto bonae voluntatis tuae coronasti nos*; quasi dicat, Pro scuto coronationis nostrae habemus bonam voluntatem tuam, quae nos hic defendit, et ibi coronat' (see above, nn. 30 and 35).



of iconography, the explanation of the halo given by Brother Thomas was not totally capricious. A number of passages in the Vulgate Bible may have given his claim that the Romans had made this imaginative use of their bucklers a degree of plausibility. Those texts are the 'remote context' mentioned above.

King Solomon's decoration of his palace 'in the forest of Lebanon' (3 Reg 10:16, 17) included 'two hundred shields, *scuta*, of the purest gold ... and three hundred small crescent-shaped bucklers, *peltae*, of tested gold'.<sup>37</sup> The bride of Solomon's Song of Songs (Cant 4:4) was extolled, not only for the beauty of her throat, but also for her necklace: 'Like the tower of David is your throat; from it hang a thousand bucklers'.<sup>38</sup> In his *Scriptum super Sententiis* Brother Thomas had interpreted the Song of Songs image allegorically as referring through the person of David to Jesus, through the 'tower' to faith or to the Church, whereas the 'bucklers' there were taken to be the theological 'arguments' and 'authorities', *rationes et auctoritates*, of 'the saints',<sup>39</sup> these last Christian scholars as distinguished from unbelieving philosophers. When the Machabees cleansed and restored the Temple 'They adorned the face of the Temple with golden crowns and small shields, *scutulis*' (1 Mach 4:57).<sup>40</sup>

All elements of his reading of Ps 5:13 with which we began are present: the association of shields with crowns from Machabees and that at a time before the Roman transition from the *clypeus* to the *scutum* or, in his words, before the change from the 'round shield' to the 'shield' *tout court*. The useful 'round shields' had biblical warrant as an adornment, whether of Solomon's palace or, in a literary image, of a girl's throat. Why not as an adornment of a saint's head, as paintings invited him to think?

We ought to recognize that thirteenth-century shields bore little resemblance either to the round buckler of antiquity or to the ancient oblong shield. The buckler was obsolescent at the time of the Bayeux tapestry, embroidered almost 200 years before Aquinas wrote: there are but ten represented as against 230 representations of the long, triangular shields.<sup>41</sup> Between Hastings and Aquinas, developments in

<sup>37</sup> 'Fecit quoque rex Salomon ducenta scuta de auro purissimo (sexcentos auri siclos dedit in laminas scuti unius), et trecentas peltas ex auro probato (trecentae minae auri unam peltam vestiebant); posuitque eas rex in domo Saltus Libani' (3 Reg 10:16-17).

<sup>38</sup> 'Sicut turris David collum tuum, / quae aedificata est cum propugnaculis: / mille clypei pendent ex ea, / omnis armatura fortium' (Cant 4:4).

<sup>39</sup> 'Per David significatur Christus: turris ejus est fides vel Ecclesia; clypei sunt rationes et auctoritates sanctorum' (*In 1 Sent.*, divisio textus prologi cum ejus expositione [ed. Mandonnet, 1.21]).

<sup>40</sup> 'Et ornaverunt faciem templi coronis aureis et scutulis ...' (1 Mach 4:57).

<sup>41</sup> Of the ten *clypei*, one is an ovoid shield, neither clearly a *clypeus* nor the characteristic triangular *scutum* that dominates the artifact; see *The Bayeux Tapestry*, introduction, description and commentary by D. M. Wilson (New York, 1985), pl. 70. No *clypeus* is carried by a Norman, but 3 are on the ground beside corpses not easily identified as English or Norman (as are 14 *scuta* as well); a fourth *clypeus* lies beside the corpse of an English warrior since his axe is beside him; it may be

helmet and body armor had radically reduced the size and shape of the knight's shield. It had become smaller with the development of armor for the lower leg; the top edge was no longer bowed to protect the face, now completely covered, but at Hastings guarded by a nasal alone. Aquinas, therefore, knew a small, easily managed, triangular war-shield (as distinguished from a somewhat larger, rectangular jousting-shield).

Aquinas followed the lead of his texts when they used the term *clipeus*. Thus, in his *Expositio* of Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* 5.2 (1130a17-18), he expanded slightly the 'qui abiecit clipeum propter timorem' of his Latin Aristotle, but maintained the term *clipeum*: 'cum aliquis miles abiecit *clipeum* in bello propter timiditatem' and did the same with the Philosopher's *De anima* 2.11 (423b15-17). Hence, although apt to speak of *scutum* when his text did not impose *clipeus* upon him, Aquinas expressed a preference for Jerome's translation of Ps 3:4. Where the Vulgate gives *Tu autem Domine, susceptor meus es; / gloria mea, et exaltans caput meum* Jerome had been right to translate the median phrase as *Clypeus meus circa me*.<sup>42</sup>

It is not without interest that the *clypeus-scutum* variation has attracted the attention of a contemporary exegete on Ps 18(17):36(35). The Hebrew *mgn* there was rendered by the Septuagint, Quinta, and Symmachus as ὑπερασπίσμον, but by Aquila as θυρεόν. This variation, the Scripture scholar argues, does not bear witness to a variation in the Hebrew text, but to the variant efforts of the Greek translators to convey that the device was either a 'super-buckler' or a 'door-like shield'.<sup>43</sup>

assumed that all *clypei* are English. To conclude, 78 *scuta* are represented as used by English warriors as against 139 in use by Normans, two of these last apparently pressed into service as trays for food (pl. 47); the distinction between Normans and English is made on the basis of (a) cavalry in full armor is Norman and infantry in the same type of armor is English, (b) the Norman coiffure, (c) English moustaches, (d) the Latin texts included in the embroidery.

<sup>42</sup> '... Dicit ergo, *Tu autem Domine*; quasi dicat: Isti insurgunt ad bellandum, sed tu suscipis ad protegendum. Et hoc est melius per litteram Hieronymi quae dicit: *Clypeus meus circa me*, quasi defendens me sicut clypeus' (*In ps* 3:2 [14.156]); for Jerome see *Liber psalmorum* 3:4 (PL 28.1190A).

<sup>43</sup> B. Couroyer, 'Ta droite assiste mon épée', *Revue biblique* 93.1 (1986) 40-41: 'La seule traduction rigoureuse est celle qui garde la notion de salut contre "your shield of victory" car le bouclier, arme défensive, ne saurait à lui seul assurer la victoire, même si celui qui le porte sort vainqueur du combat.

On voit que les textes grecs reflètent un même texte hébreu et l'on ne saurait arguer, pour un texte hébreu différent, de l'alternance de *hyperaspismon* (de *aspis*, bouclier rond: *clypeus*) et de *thureos*, bouclier long en forme de porte (*scutum*). Il s'agit dans les deux cas d'un bouclier, l'un plus grand que l'autre, ce dont un traducteur grec a pu ne pas tenir compte.' (The Greek texts at stake are those of Aquila (*thureon*) and of Symmachus, Quinta, and LXX (*hyperaspismon*); they translate the MT *mgn*).

## KNIGHTS AND THEIR HORSES

Aspects of knighthood other than shields provided Brother Thomas with other useful similes and analogies. Thus, he was obliged on occasion to set out the connection between what is freely willed and the necessary consequences linked to any freely chosen option. This necessity he saw as ultimately based upon the principle of being, since Being is for him the most appropriate of all divine Names.<sup>44</sup> Brother Thomas did not shrink from applying this necessity to the sovereignly free Creator: 'If He wills to make a human, it follows that He must give him rationality'.<sup>45</sup> Aquinas had earlier appealed to the parallel of a generous king and a candidate for knighthood who owned no horse. 'Should a king make someone a knight, a *miles*, out of liberality', that is to say, out of no compelling necessity, 'since one cannot be a knight without a horse, on the supposition of the aforesaid liberality it becomes a debt and a necessity that he <the king> give him a horse'.<sup>46</sup> The king's 'liberality' has led to a self-imposed compulsion, parallel to that which makes it 'necessary' for the Creator to grant rationality to us, once our creation has been willed.

The correlation of king, knight, and horse served his turn when Aquinas set out the position of a theologian who might clumsily ascribe predestined grace to merits foreseen by the Holy One. This would be 'as if a king should give a horse to some knight whom he knew was going to make good use of it'!<sup>47</sup> Such foresight as motive would diminish the liberality of the king. In a theological context it would vitiate the gratuitous aspect of the Creator's free gift: such a 'grace' could hardly be an authentic grace. What is here significant is neither the logic of consequences, nor the necessities within the freedom of creation, nor the theology of grace and predestination, but rather the fact that Aquinas chose an illustration both feudal and military. According to the understanding of the thirteenth century, a knight without a horse was as inconceivable as a human being bereft of the essential principle of rationality that differentiates us from the beasts.

This is visible by implication in the way that Brother Thomas set out the meaning of the term *miles* as used by his contemporaries in distinction from the usage of the Romans in antiquity. In the living Latin of the Middle Ages, as in the

<sup>44</sup> See *ST* 1.13.11 in corp. and on the Tetragrammaton *ibid.* ad 1; cf. *ST* 1.13.9 in corp. ad fin.

<sup>45</sup> 'Sed ex quo supponitur quod Deus aliquid facere velit, per modum cuiusdam debiti ex suppositione liberalitatis ipsius sequitur quod faciat ea sine quibus res illa volita esse non potest, sicut si facere vult hominem quod det ei rationem ...' (*Quaestiones disputatae de veritate* 6.2 [Leonine edition 22.181, ll. 232-237]).

<sup>46</sup> '... sicut rex ex sua liberalitate facit aliquem militem, sed quia non potest esse miles nisi habeat equum, efficitur debitum et necessarium ex suppositione liberalitatis praedictae quod ei det equum' (*ibid.*, ll. 221-225).

<sup>47</sup> '... sicut si rex det alicui militi equum, quem scit eo bene usurum' (*ST* 1.23.5 in corp. [1.163a]).

Latin of ancient times, the normative warrior was named a *miles*; we have seen *miles* used to designate the father of the Saint, Landulf of Aquino. Brother Thomas thought it right to inform his readers on precisely how the meaning given *miles* by the ancients differed from contemporary usage. In a way that evidently seemed remarkable to Aquinas, since he remarked upon it, the Romans had included foot soldiers as well as their cavalry among those to whom the term referred.<sup>48</sup> In the thirteenth century a *miles* was a cavalryman, heavily armored, in short a knight. He knew that the Romans (Romulus)<sup>49</sup> had stratified their populace into economically qualified classes: senators, soldiers, and plebians, a legendary version of the historically attested division into *equites* at the top, citizens capable of providing themselves with horses and expensive armor, but supported by descending grades of less and less well equipped soldiers. He recognized that infantry constituted the mass of the Roman armies. Aquinas used the term *eques*, not only for the noble knight, but for anyone who might ride a horse. In a revelatory line he adverted to 'the human being' (*homo*, not *vir*) who 'at times is enraged by irrational beings, for instance, a scribe out of rage flings away a pen or the rider of a horse (*eques*, not *miles*) strikes a horse'.<sup>50</sup> This disedifying display he counted as not fully human; because manifested against objects incapable of justice and injustice, such wrath reduces us to the level of brutes with their pseudo-anger that arises from instinct and imagination. Brother Thomas also had read the neutral use as seen above in Job 40:21 and he even used it himself in a way that clearly implies knighthood: one learns to command the cavalry by serving with them, and it is an *eques* who thus serves.<sup>51</sup>

Because he knew both the ancient use and the mediaeval use, when he found *miles* in the Latin Aristotle, for instance, he realized he might be dealing with foot soldiers; when he used *miles* in his own right it is always said of a knight.

In the authors known to Aquinas, the cavalry of antiquity remained an auxiliary arm.<sup>52</sup> Without stirrups both heavy body armor and shock tactics were impractic-

<sup>48</sup> '... milites enim dicebantur antiquitus non solum equites, sed quicumque pugnatores ad vincendum, unde sub militari <arte> continetur non solum equestris, sed omnis ars vel virtus ordinata ad bellicam operationem, sicut sagittaria, fundibularia vel quaecumque alia huiusmodi' (*Sententia libri Ethicorum* 1.1 [1094a9-14] [Leonine edition 47.6, ll. 243-248]).

<sup>49</sup> '... Sicut enim in celo est triplex hierarchia angelorum, scilicet superior, media et inferior sic in civitate consilarii vel iudices, milites et populus. Nam primo apud Romanos Romulus divisit civitatem in senatores, milites et populum' (text in G. Meersseman, 'La prédication dominicaine dans les congrégations mariales en Italie au xiii<sup>e</sup> siècle', *Archivum fratrum praedicatorum* 18 [1942] 160).

<sup>50</sup> '... homo quandoque irascitur rebus irrationalibus, puta cum scriptor ex ira proicit pennam, vel eques percutit equum' (*ST* 1-2.46.7 arg. 1 [2.956a]).

<sup>51</sup> '... sicut principari equestribus addiscit aliquis per hoc quod inter equites subiectus fuit, et esse dux exercitus addiscit' (*Sententia libri Politicorum* 3.3 [Leonine edition 48.A 195, ll. 219-221]).

<sup>52</sup> Aquinas knew and used Caesar (102-44 B.C.), Livy (59 B.C.-A.D. 17), Frontinus (A.D. 40-103), and Renatus Vegetius, fourth century A.D.

cable; furthermore, the most useful of his classical authors, Renatus Vegetius, held the effectiveness of Rome's first experiments with heavy cavalry, the 'cataphracts', to be limited owing to the weight of their armor.<sup>53</sup> After the harsh lesson when heavily armored Gothic horse rode down the legions of foot at Adrianopolis, A.D. 378, Roman armies inaugurated the shift from infantry to cavalry that was to last a thousand years. Lightly armed mediaeval infantry, all but unprotected by armor, became auxiliaries to knights in full armor, thus reversing the situation of the Roman period to which the sources of Brother Thomas referred.<sup>54</sup> A consequent diversity of weapons, which Aquinas also noted, was that the mediaeval foot soldiers used arrows and slings to engage the enemy at a distance, *a remotis*, whereas the knight with sword and lance for striking, guarded by 'a cuirass for his own protection', closed with the enemy *de propinquo*.<sup>55</sup> The mediaeval foot soldier was well advised to fight with missile-weapons when he could, to close with knife or pike only when he must.

#### KNIGHTS AND THE COMMUNITY

For Thomas Aquinas human society was a unity in diversity and he indicated the lawful place held by the military in that overarching unity of diverse components. Members of an organized human multitude are distinguished by their distinct goals. The goal of the medical practitioner is health, that of a knight victory,<sup>56</sup> that of a merchant wealth. Each such group was regulated by its own 'law .... Thus the laws imposed on the knights differ from those imposed on one

<sup>53</sup> 'Catafracti equites propter munima, quae gerunt, a uulneribus tuti, sed propter inpedimentum et pondus armorum capi faciles et laqueis frequenter obnoxii, contra dispersos pedites quam contra equites in certamine meliores ...' (*Flavi Vegeti Renati Epitoma rei militaris* 3.23, ed. C. Lang [Leipzig, 1885], pp. 115-16).

<sup>54</sup> F. Lot, *L'art militaire et les armées au Moyen Age en Europe et dans le Proche Orient* 2 (Paris, 1946), pp. 412-13: 'Quant au monde romain, il semble qu'il ne comprenne pas vite la révolution de l'art militaire. Il en reste à la légion, soutenue d'un peu de cavalerie, de type archaïque. Ainsi doivent s'expliquer les défaites des empereurs romains du milieu du III<sup>e</sup> siècle, Dèce, tué par les Goths, Valérien battu, fait prisonnier et mis à mort par Shapoûr.

Il faut alors se décider à transformer la cavalerie romaine. Alors apparaissent les "cataphractaires", cuirassés de la tête aux pieds. L'Empire augmente considérablement le nombre de ses cavaliers, cuirassés ou non, surtout dans la *pars Orientis*, au IV<sup>e</sup> siècle ....

C'est que l'infanterie, tout en passant au second rang dans l'estime militaire, demeure l'auxiliaire utile, parfois indispensable, de la cavalerie.'

<sup>55</sup> 'Impugnat etiam homo a remotis per sagittas et lapides fundae ...' (*Exp. super Iob* 41:19 [26.226, ll. 332-333]); 'Impugnat autem homo et de propinquo et a remotis: de propinquo quidem munitus gladio et hasta ad percussionem, et thorace ad sui munitionem' (ibid. 41:17 [p. 225, ll. 312-315]); '... neque thorax, quo scilicet munitur pectus, ...' (ll. 319-320).

<sup>56</sup> '... in medicinali arte bonum intentum est sanitas et in militari victoria et in aliis artibus aliquod aliud bonum' (*Sent. libri Ethic.* 1.9 [47.31, ll. 28-30]).

who buys, differ from those imposed on one who sells'.<sup>57</sup> His perspective on this was clearly aristocratic; he prized the law of the knights over that of all other classes in secular society. A knight who fell from grace might pass over and find himself under the law 'of peasants, or of merchants'.<sup>58</sup> In such a social disaster Brother Thomas saw a parallel with the fall of our race in the sin of Adam.<sup>59</sup> His acceptance of social stratification made it appear obvious to him that a blow to a knight would be a more grievous fault than a blow to a peasant.<sup>60</sup>

A knight was bound 'to fight in the king's array precisely as a knight, *inquantum miles*; this a knight owes to him from whom he holds a grant of land, a *feudum*'.<sup>61</sup> Should a knight fight against his king 'then he would merit the loss of his grant of land'.<sup>62</sup>

Still, Aquinas was not blind to the responsibility of a feudal superior. Using the highest civil rank in his world, that of emperor, Brother Thomas conceded that 'sometimes an emperor sins by commanding, whereas a devoted knight does not sin by obeying, above all, if this sinfulness is not evident to the knight'.<sup>63</sup> It is tempting to think that St. Thomas had in mind the Emperor Frederick II, feudal overlord of the *Regnum Siciliae* and thus of the Aquino family. In the eyes of the Saint, Frederick had been responsible for the 'martyrdom' of his brother Rinaldo, dead for the sake of Church and Faith.<sup>64</sup> Without implying that Aquinas might have

<sup>57</sup> '... diversis legibus regulari: aliae enim leges imponendae sunt militi; aliae emptori; aliae venditori ...' (*In librum beati Dionysii De divinis nominibus expositio* 12, lect. un., n. 946, ed. C. Pera [Turin-Rome, 1950], p. 355).

<sup>58</sup> '... si miles ex militia destituatur, transibit in legem rusticorum vel mercatorum' (*ST* 1-2.91.6 in corp. [2.1214b]).

<sup>59</sup> 'Est ergo hominis lex, quam sortitur ex ordinatione divina .... Quae quidem lex fuit tam valida in primo statu, ut nihil vel praeter rationem vel contra rationem posset subrepere homini. Sed dum homo a Deo recessit, incurrit in hoc quod feratur secundum impetum sensualitatis ... inquantum per divinam iustitiam homo destituatur originali iustitia et vigore rationis, ipse impetus sensualitatis qui eum ducit, habet rationem legis ...' (*ibid.*, pp. 1214b-15a).

<sup>60</sup> 'Manifestum est enim quod quanto maior est contra quem peccatur, tanto peccatum est gravius: sicut qui dat alapam militi, gravius reputatur quam si daret rustico, et adhuc multo gravius si principi uel regi' (*Compendium theologiae* 1.183 [Leonine edition 42.153, ll. 22-26]).

<sup>61</sup> '... pugnare in acie regis inquantum miles — hoc debet ei propter feudum quod tenet ab eo — est actus iustitiae' (*In 3 Sent.* 9.1.1, q1a. 4 ad 3 [3.302, n. 23]).

<sup>62</sup> '... si miles contra regem peccat ut feudum mereatur amittere ...' (*Compendium theologiae* 1.195 [42.156, ll. 18-19]).

<sup>63</sup> '... aliquando Imperator peccat praecipiendo, quod devotus miles non peccat obediendo; maxime si militi non constet illud esse peccatum' (*Quaestiones quodlibetales* 12.18.3 ad 3 [Turin, 1956], p. 236).

<sup>64</sup> Pope Clement IV seems to have shared the conviction that the Aquino family had considerable merit in their opposition to Frederick: 'Et ideo oblatas sibi (that is, to Thomas Aquinas) dignitates et redditus a B.M. Clemente IV, Summo Pontifice, qui dictum doctorem nimis carum habebat, ipse simul renuit redditus et honores .... Cum tamen praedictus Doctor omnes qui sui generis propinquos et nobiles, sub persecutione Frederici imperatoris pro causa Ecclesiae haberet in Campania profugos: quibus ad subveniendum de bonis etiam ecclesiasticis de licentia Summi Pontificis movere eum poterat naturalis affectio, et ad tam nobiles pro causa Ecclesiae exules caritatis debita gratitudo: Qui

been disposed to defend indefensible twentieth-century totalitarian brutality, it may be noted that figures less respectable than Frederick Hohenstaufen would use at Nuremberg a caricature of the reasoning here proffered: they had acted 'under orders', evil ultimate goals of their superiors had not been 'evident' to them. On the contrary, Aquinas specifically denied that a knight has any obligation to obey a superior, a 'duke',<sup>65</sup> in an 'unjust' war.<sup>66</sup>

Because ideal order is hardly to be expected in human affairs, Aquinas adverted to conflicting hierarchic claims and in so doing once more availed himself of a military illustration. What were the moral options of the knight, bound to his duke, but also bound to the duke's superior, the king? As long as all remains in order, the knight is free to direct his decisions either to the goal, *bonum*, of the duke or to that of the king.<sup>67</sup> Let the duke, however, disturb the order and withdraw his allegiance from the king, then the knight must abandon the recreant duke and maintain his allegiance to the king, superior of both duke and knight.<sup>68</sup>

Thomas Aquinas took a not inconsiderable part in the defense of the mendicant orders against the severe attacks launched against them in the mid-thirteenth century. This he did, not only by specific treatises,<sup>69</sup> but also by incidental discussions in his theological syntheses as well. One such contains a passing reference to the military and there too he reversed the direction set by the pious generals: he likened his begging brethren to the class of knights. Both knights and friars, he argued, pass over their own interests for the sake of the common good;

sicut amore Dei necessitates sustinuit proprias, sic sustinere potuit alienas' (*Vita* 42 [Tocco] in *Fontes*, pp. 115-16).

<sup>65</sup> The term *dux* is often under the pen of Aquinas and the question must be raised as to whether he intends the specific mediaeval rank of 'duke' or the general meaning, current from ancient Roman times, of simply a 'military leader'. On occasion, this ancient meaning is clearly what Aquinas wished to convey; he spoke for instance of the overriding goal of the highest ranking *dux* which is victory, whereas the alignment of this or of that rank is the goal of inferior ones: '... victoria, quae est ultimus finis exercitus, est finis intentus a summo duce; ordinatio autem huius aciei vel illius, est finis intentus ab aliquo inferiorum ducum' (*ST* 1-2.18.7 in corp. [2.816b]). The 'inferior' leaders can hardly be the hereditary mediaeval dukes; still, in late imperial times the ranks of 'duke', *dux* and of 'count', *comes*, are not unknown and by the time of Aquinas the term *dux* can only have had the connotation of the high-ranking, hereditary officer, not merely any military 'leader'. Hence, although not always a 'duke', *dux* is usually translated simply as Brother Thomas must have realized it would strike his contemporaries.

<sup>66</sup> '... milites non tenentur obedire in bello iniusto' (*S. Thomae ... super epistolas s. Pauli lectura, ad Titum* 3.1, ed. R. Cai, 2 [Turin-Rome, 1953], p. 321).

<sup>67</sup> '... miles, qui ordinatur sub rege et sub duce exercitus, potest voluntatem suam ordinare in bonum ducis et non regis, aut e converso' (*Summa contra gentiles* 3.109 (Leonine manual edition) [Rome, 1934], p. 361).

<sup>68</sup> 'Sed si dux ab ordine regis recedat, bona erit voluntas militis recedentis a voluntate ducis et dirigentis voluntatem suam in regem, mala autem voluntas militis sequentis voluntatem ducis contra voluntatem regis: ordo enim inferioris principii dependet ab ordine superioris' (ibid.).

<sup>69</sup> *Contra impugnantes dei cultum et religionem* and *Contra doctrinam retrahentium a religione* (Leonine edition 41.A and 41.C).

it is 'opportune' that society sustain them both. Knights were supported by 'stipends provided by others' as were those who rule in the city. Since begging friars serve the interests of society, they too merit community support;<sup>70</sup> they have the right to beg for their sustenance.

The knight's immediate community was, of course, an army. As a city is composed of many families, so an army is composed of 'many knights'.<sup>71</sup> It has been noted that knights functioned in a structured grouping that assigned a relatively low place to a knight as a knight. His subordination to his duke might well entail hard sacrifices, for a knight's duty was to preserve the 'good' of his duke, 'neglecting even his own safety to do so'.<sup>72</sup> In the standard Thomistic view, this was rationalized in function of the relatively narrow goal of the individual knight which was, in an unexpectedly graphic phrase, 'to stretch an enemy on the ground', whereas the goal of the duke was wider: 'victory for the army'.<sup>73</sup>

#### KNIGHTHOOD'S OBLIGATIONS

Misgivings that might arise from aristocratic values accepted, if not promoted, by Brother Thomas may be balanced to a degree by his equally aristocratic sense of the obligations consequent upon a favored social level. On his standards a knight was bound to altruism, bound to fulfill duties inseparable from his status in the community as one commissioned to defend the common good with weapons. What the medical practitioner does by healing and the farmer by planting, the knight does by fighting.<sup>74</sup> Farmers and physicians, however, need not renounce as much as does the knight. In war, family ties must yield to the comradeship of arms for those arms are taken up in the same cause, a cause which, in the end, is the common good. That comradeship takes precedence over blood kinship, that

<sup>70</sup> 'Opportunum est igitur humanae societati quod illi qui, praetermissa propriorum cura, utilitati communi deserviunt, ab his quorum utilitati deserviunt, sustententur: propter hoc enim et milites de stipendiis aliorum vivunt, et rectoribus reipublicae de communi providetur. Qui autem voluntariam pauperatem assumunt ut Christum sequantur, ad hoc utique omnia dimitunt ut communi utilitati deserviant ...' (*Summa contra gentiles* 3.135 [p. 391]); see also *ST* 2-2.87.1 in corp. (3.1870a).

<sup>71</sup> 'Fit autem unum ex multis, uno quidem modo, secundum ordinem tantum: sicut ex multis domibus fit civitas, et ex multis militibus fit exercitus' (*Summa contra gentiles* 4.35 [p. 488]).

<sup>72</sup> '... ad officium boni militis pertinet ut etiam salutem suam negligat ad conservandum bonum ducis' (*Quaestio unica de caritate* 4 ad 2 [Paris edition 14.242]).

<sup>73</sup> '... Si enim considerentur rector civitatis et dux exercitus et unus singularis miles, constat quod rector civitatis est prior in ordine agentium, ad cuius imperium dux exercitus ad bellum procedit; et sub eo est miles .... Finis autem militis est prosternere hostem; quod ulterius ordinatur ad victoriam exercitus, quod est finis ducis; et hoc ulterius ordinatur ad bonum statum civitatis vel regni, quod est finis rectoris et regis' (*Quaestio disputata de potentia* 7.2 ad 10 [Turin-Rome, 1953], p. 192).

<sup>74</sup> '... aliquis homo habeat ... aliquam efficaciam in aliquibus corporalibus faciendis, quas alius non habet; puta medicus in sanando, et agricola in plantando, et miles in pugnando' (*Summa contra gentiles* 3.92 [p. 335]).



primaevael bond modified, but not obliterated, by feudal allegiance. The authority of the warlord entails obedience to him and displaces the obedience normally 'due to one's father'.<sup>75</sup> As every citizen is obliged to obey the ruler of his city, so the knight is obliged to obey his leader, his duke.<sup>76</sup> Because that obedience takes place in circumstances of personal danger, it entails 'works of fortitude'.<sup>77</sup>

Passages from the *Nicomachean Ethics*<sup>78</sup> occasioned a number of revealing interpretations by Brother Thomas. The worthy knight neither abandons the line of battle, nor takes to his heels, nor throws away his buckler.<sup>79</sup> His feudal preoccupation and a textual infelicity have resulted in a subtle shift in the Philosopher's meaning as expounded by Aquinas. The Philosopher was concerned with the relationship between a given base act and its corresponding vice; his 'one who throws away his buckler' (doubtless a terrified citizen-soldier in the author's intention) has become in the exposition of Aquinas 'some knight', *aliquis miles*. In the same passage the Latin translation presented Aquinas with one who might 'abandon the leader of the army', 'si derelinquit ducem exercitus'. As Aristotle in his first line had not spoken of 'a soldier', and still less of 'a knight', so in the second he had not mentioned a 'leader'. The military failure he arraigned was, in his Greek, desertion of the comrade 'standing beside' one in the ranks, one's παραστάτης. In this case too, Aquinas made the delinquent warrior *aliquis miles* and his victim 'a leader' if not 'a duke'. This mild infidelity to Aristotle is a lapse of the translator, not of Aquinas as commentator. Perhaps the translator was misled by the prefix παρα and read it as if it were προ, 'before' rather than 'beside'. A παραστάτης could thus have become a προστάτης, a 'front-rank

<sup>75</sup> Text is taken from a preliminary argument, accepted by Aquinas in a discriminating response (see below, n. 76): '... miles plus obedit duci exercitus quam patri' (*Quaestio unica de caritate* 9.15 [Paris edition 14.257]).

<sup>76</sup> '... plus debet exhibere dilectionis affectum parentibus quam extraneis; nisi forte inquantum in bono alicujus extranei penderet bonum commune ... ut cum aliquis se ipsum periculo mortis exponit, ad salvandum in bello ducem exercitus, vel in civitate principem civitatis ... inquantum est civis vel miles, plus debet obedire rectori civitatis, vel duci, quod (*sic*) patri' (ibid. ad 15 [p. 259]).

<sup>77</sup> The formula is from the Latin translation of Aristotle used by Aquinas, *NE* 5.2 (1129b19 ff.) (Leonine edition 47<sup>2</sup>.268, l. 61): 'opera fortitudinis'.

<sup>78</sup> '... lex praecipit ... puta cum praecipit quod miles non derelinquat aciem et quod non fugiat neque proiciat arma ...', to which must be added the Philosopher's remark at 1130a14 ff.: '... qui abiecit clipeum propter timorem' (ibid. [p. 271.17-18]); and at l. 30: '... si derelinquit ducem exercitus ad timiditatem ....' Aquinas remained close to the letter of Aristotle's instances of failures in the 'works of fortitude': '... opera fortitudinis, puta cum praecipit quod miles non derelinquat aciem et quod non fugiat neque proiciat arma' (ibid. [p. 268.61-63]) and '... si autem aliquis miles in bello derelinquat ducem exercitus, reducitur hoc ad malitiam timiditatis' (ibid. [p. 273.81-83]).

<sup>79</sup> In the presence of the extreme verbal fidelity of Aquinas to a text he was expounding it will be reassuring to note his account of what a brave knight does without the control of such a text: '... miles, defendendo castrum regis, et implet opus fortitudinis non refugiens mortis pericula ...' (*ST* 2-2.104.2 ad 1 [3.1965b]).

man', in short, a *dux*. If a knight ought not to break ranks, the thing can be put more positively: effective knights maintain their array united and act in concert.<sup>80</sup>

Thomistic realism is conspicuous in an expansion of Aristotle's remark that the best soldiers may, perhaps, be those who are less brave than their fellows. The Philosopher knew that if the harsh 'good' of courage did not move warriors, they yet might trade their lives for 'trifling gains', what Aquinas had before him as *ad parva lucra*. Those 'trifling gains' not specified, Aquinas spelled out what counts in a soldier's eyes: his pay and his loot.<sup>81</sup> This evidence of Thomist realism is nuanced by his comment on the corruption of knights by material gain: 'It is nothing to wonder at if knights have been corrupted by money; one of the disciples ....'<sup>82</sup> Judas had betrayed a higher loyalty than that of a knight for only thirty pieces of silver; in a chilling sentence, 'Knights are rapacious'.<sup>83</sup>

Ideally taken, knights ought to 'abstain from whatever distracts from combat, for instance, from business affairs and from delights'.<sup>84</sup> To a friar, asceticism on the part of the ideal military man seemed essential and this friar thought he saw the rationale for this in the very conditions of campaigning: 'It is manifest that the leader of an army does not spare his active knights, whether it be in the matter of perils or of labors'.<sup>85</sup>

There is also a realistic, not to say cynical, aspect to his acceptance of received military doctrine (he knew that both Aristotle and Vegetius had made the point)

<sup>80</sup> '... milites in acie oportet uniri et concorditer agere ad hoc quod victoriam, quae est communis finis, consequantur' (*Summa contra gentiles* 3.151 [p. 409]).

<sup>81</sup> The *parva lucra* of the Latin Aristotle translates πρὸς μικρὰ at NE 3.9 (1117b20): 'Milites autem nihil forsitan prohibet non tales esse optimos, sed eos qui minus quidem fortes, aliud autem bonum nullum habentes; parati enim quidem isti ad pericula et vitam ad parva lucra permutant'; on which Aquinas commented '... sed vitam suam, quam exponunt discrimini, quodam modo commutant ad parva lucra, puta stipendiorum vel praedae' (Leonine edition 47.176, ll. 17-20 and 178, ll. 129-132).

<sup>82</sup> This observation by Aquinas refers to the Gospel according to Matthew 28:12-15: 'At illi, accepta pecunia, fecerunt sicut erant edocti. Non est mirum si milites corrupti fuerunt pro pecunia, quia et unus de discipulis ejus corruptus erat' (*Commentarium super Matthaeum* 28 [Paris edition 19.665]).

<sup>83</sup> 'Consideremus quomodo studuit proficere Beatus Martinus in quolibet statu. In statu militari studuit proficere in misericordia et pietate. Et rationabiliter, quia milites sunt rapaces' (*Sermo 41, in festo beati Martini* [Paris edition 32.807]).

<sup>84</sup> 'Est etiam negotiationis usus nocivus quam plurimum exercitio militari: negotiatoribus namque, dum umbram colunt, a laboribus uacant et fruuntur deliciis, mollescunt animi et corpora redduntur debilia et ad labores militares inepta; unde secundum iura ciuilia negotiatio est militibus interdicta' (*De regno ad regem Cypri* 2.7 (2.3) [Leonine edition 42.471, ll. 61-67]): '... athletas et milites necesse est a multis delectationibus abstinere, ut officium proprium exequantur' (*ST* 2-2.142.1 in corp. [3.2118b]).

<sup>85</sup> 'Manifestum est enim quod dux exercitus strenuis militibus non parci a periculis aut laboribus, sed secundum quod militiae ratio exigit interdum eos et maioribus laboribus et maioribus periculis exponit, sed post victoriam adeptam magis strenuos plus honorat ...' (*Exp. super Iob* 7:1 [26.46, ll. 42-47]).

that no element, courage included, is more important than is training in the production of an effective warrior. 'Knights are rendered brave through experience'<sup>86</sup> and no one becomes more the medical man, or more the knight, by contemplating a separated idea of 'the good'!<sup>87</sup> Hard training does what Platonic dreaming will not; practice rather than theory guarantees victory. Experienced knights will not look upon 'noisy arms, a concourse of horses, and other things of that sort', as terrifying.<sup>88</sup> But is this authentic courage or skillful conditioning? In agreement with Vegetius, the acknowledged expert on military training, and with Aristotle, an equally acknowledged expert on moral virtue, Aquinas held that military 'courage' is less a moral virtue than the sure result of long and arduous drill.<sup>89</sup> It may well appear that courage is commonly found among the military, but 'knights who possess it are usually those who have training and who possess the art of warfare'.<sup>90</sup> All three, Aristotle, Vegetius, and Aquinas, can be read as holding that training removes fear and without fear courage is nugatory. Aquinas quoted Vegetius with approval when he wrote that 'No one fears to do what he is confident he has learned well.'<sup>91</sup>

This military truism Aquinas adopted in the controversies that erupted in his time over the early training of those destined for the religious life, notably for the mendicant orders such as his own, the Order of Preachers. Just as the military training which he had observed in his family begins with the young, so religious orders must be free to receive those to be trained while the candidates are still

<sup>86</sup> '... cum quidam alii sint fortes per experientiam in quibusdam aliis rebus, in rebus bellicis milites sunt fortes per experientiam ...' (*Sent. libri Ethicorum* 3.16 [47.170, ll. 132-134]); in his exposition of Aristotle's text, 1116a16-b23, Aquinas is not more gentle than the Philosopher had been in his estimate of the professional warrior's purported courage; the truly brave are the civilian soldiers, the 'civiliter fortes permanentes', who choose death rather than the disgrace of flight whereas the professionals, the knights of Aquinas, take flight when they see that the enemy is stronger: 'Non est autem ita de forti, qui magis timet turpitudinem quam mortem' (ibid. [p. 171.177-178]).

<sup>87</sup> '... illud bonum separatum est omnino inutile ad scientias et artes ... etiam quantum ad acquisitionem scientiae vel artis, nullus enim efficitur magis medicus vel magis miles per hoc quod contemplatur ideam separatam boni' (ibid. 1.8 (1097a8) [47.29, ll. 65-71]).

<sup>88</sup> '... in bellis multa sunt inania, quae scilicet inexpertis terrorem incutunt, quamvis parum vel nihil periculi habeant, sicut fragor armorum, concursus equorum et alia huiusmodi, quae quidem milites maxime aspexerunt per experientiam non esse terribilia; unde videntur fortes' (ibid. 3.16 [47.170, ll. 135-141]).

<sup>89</sup> '... aliqui esse fortes ... propter experientiam, sicut milites, quae magis pertinent ad artem quam ad virtutem moralem ...' (*ST* 2-2.123.1 arg. 2); in his response Aquinas concedes the 'exterior act of virtue', not authentic virtue itself: '... hoc accidit propter scientiam et artem quandam; sicut contingit in militibus ... aestimantes se per suam artem posse contra ea defendi ...' (ibid. [3.2042a-b]).

<sup>90</sup> '... militaris fortitudo dicitur quia eam consueverunt habere milites qui habent exercitium et artem bellandi ...' (*In 3 Sent.* 33.3.3 Solut. 3 [3.1090, n. 355]).

<sup>91</sup> '... sicut Vegetius dicit in libro *De Re Militari*: "Nemo facere metuit quod se bene didicisse confidit"' (*ST* 2-2.123.1 ad 2 [3.2042b]).

young.<sup>92</sup> The rigors of warfare are comparable to the rigors of the religious life. With unaccustomed asperity Aquinas observed 'just as we see that those who wish to become knights are not first put through a training in wool production, but rather from boyhood do their exercising in the militia ...' so for the same reason ought those who will enter the religious life to be trained to it from childhood.<sup>93</sup> If he had heard stories of his older brothers training when they were small boys and had seen them practising in the tiltyards of family castles, Brother Thomas had himself experienced an early induction into the religious life at Monte Cassino from about the age of five. Whether he was or was not technically an *oblatus* is, from this point of view, irrelevant. Here it is not out of place to recall the warmth of his address to the abbot of Monte Cassino in his penultimate work, the brief, but expert, letter on divine knowledge of the contingent future.<sup>94</sup> That warmth is such that it impelled at least one scholar to question the letter's authenticity: the address, it was argued, is too respectful of the abbot not to be the work of a Benedictine.<sup>95</sup> No doubt the editor of this document was right to have written that 'St. Thomas could not have forgotten his first Benedictine formation; the formulae of respect which he had learned as a young oblate remained familiar to him ...'.<sup>96</sup> True enough, but it is also true that his arguments as an adult in favor of a youthful induction into the religious life owe something to his personal experience; that he put it more than once in terms of a parallel with training for knighthood owes everything to his place in feudal society.

The comparison of religious asceticism with military drill evokes that most mediaeval of institutions, the religious military orders. For the Church took two stances on an armed clergy. As noted above, the combination was outlawed in general, but there was a spectacular exception begotten by the necessities of the crusades. Not only had the Church urged laymen, knights especially, 'to go across

<sup>92</sup> '... qui futuri sunt clerici mox a pueritia in clericatu erudiuntur, qui futuri sunt milites oportet quod a pueritia in militaribus exercitiis nutrantur, sicut dicit Vegetius in libro De re militari ...' (*Contra doctrinam retrahentium* 3 [41.B-C 44, ll. 154-157]).

<sup>93</sup> '... sicut videmus quod illi qui volunt fieri milites, non prius exercitantur in lanificio, sed a pueritia exercentur in militia; similiter qui volunt fieri clerici, non prius exercentur in vita laicali, sed a pueritia instruuntur in vita clericali' (*Quaestiones quodlibetales* 4.12.1 ad 2 [Turin-Rome, 1956], p. 90).

<sup>94</sup> 'La lettre de saint Thomas à l'Abbé du Montcassin', ed. A. Dondaine in *St. Thomas Aquinas. 1274-1974. Commemorative Studies*, 2 vols. (Toronto, 1974), 1.87-108; since this publication of a diplomatic and a normalized text (pp. 102-105 and pp. 106-108 respectively with an introduction and notes), the same editor has published the letter in vol. 42 of the Leonine edition (Rome, 1979, pp. 395-415 with an extensive introduction: *Epistola ad Bernardum abbatem Casinensem*. These editions supersede ten earlier publications of this text.

<sup>95</sup> Thus F. Scandone whose *La vita* ..., pp. 31-32 is cited by Dondaine in *Commemorative Studies* 1.95 n. 13.

<sup>96</sup> 'Saint Thomas ne pouvait avoir oublié sa première formation bénédictine; les formules de respect qu'il avait apprises jeune oblat lui étaient familières ...' (ibid., p. 95).

the sea' and 'to expose themselves to many a peril for the honor of Christ',<sup>97</sup> she had authorized the foundation of religious orders whose members were simultaneously religious brothers or priests and knights. With respect to those elite troops Brother Thomas made a number of wry comments. 'We do not see that religious knights repel secular knights from their army – nor the converse!';<sup>98</sup> 'Nor does it smack of vice, *non est vitiosum*, that some knights abstain from all the joys of love in order that they the more freely attend to warlike matters'.<sup>99</sup> May one not think that beneath this second line of Aquinas there lies an anxiety to scotch rumors of the sort that would be exploited to bring down the Templars a generation later?

Yet another instance of an unexpected appeal to military analogy is wider in its base than are the military orders, but most frequently verified of them. This occurred in his discussion of the appropriateness of the 'ordering' of the ten commandments. Not unexpectedly, Brother Thomas argued that their traditional ordering is suitable and did so on a parallel between believers and the Holy One, between a knight and his leader, his duke. What justifies recalling this here is that he added the judgment that the gravest violation in both these relationships would be to deal with the enemies of God or of the duke. Crusaders were often under pressure to make pacts with the enemy in the Holy Land. The military orders, charged with garrisoning Christian fortresses after one wave of crusaders receded and the next had not arrived, often enough a generation later, necessarily felt the need to establish a *modus vivendi* with the surrounding sea of Islamic warriors. It is hard to think that such pacts, struck by the Templars, for instance, were inspired by cowardice or by infidelity to Church policy. The unreservedly negative indictment by Thomas Aquinas, 'a knight acts against his sworn faith, *infideliter*, when he strikes a pact with the enemy ...'<sup>100</sup> may well go back to accusations against the *bête noire* of the Aquinas family, the Emperor Frederick II. After years of wavering, Frederick had finally gone to the Holy Land on crusade, but once there had signed a treaty with the Moslems. The highest local Church authority, the Latin Patriarch, denounced this with bitterness and his denunciation was echoed by the highest of all Church authorities, Pope Gregory IX.<sup>101</sup>

<sup>97</sup> '... homo posset se exponere periculo gladii propter Christum laudabiliter etiam si haberet aliud quod faceret, sicut legitur de multis martyribus ... alias non liceret militibus ire ultra mare et exponere se multis periculis propter Christi honorem' (*Contra impugnantes* 6.6 [41.A 103, ll. 830-837]).

<sup>98</sup> '... non enim videmus quod milites religiosi repellant milites saeculares a suo exercitu nec e converso' (ibid. 3.4 [p. A 65.224-226]).

<sup>99</sup> '... non est vitiosum quod aliqui milites abstinant ab omnibus delectationibus venereis ut liberior vacent rebus bellicis' (*Sent. libri Ethicorum* 2.2 [1104a27] [47.81, ll. 129-131]).

<sup>100</sup> 'Maiusque peccatum est in exercitu si miles infideliter agens cum hoste pactum habeat, quam si aliquam irreverentiam faciat duci; et hoc est etiam gravius quam si in aliquo obsequio ducis deficiens inveniatur' (*ST* 1-2.100.6 in corp. [2.1266a]).

<sup>101</sup> See *Les registres de Grégoire IX*, ed. L. Auvray, vol. 1: *Années I à VIII* (Paris, 1896) for the

Aquinas was in a tradition, from one point of view ancient, but from another relatively recent, when he dealt with the metaphorical 'character' ascribed by theologians to certain sacraments. The tradition was ancient because it can be documented abundantly as stemming from a literary image, a *similitudo*, of Augustine in his anti-Donatist polemic. It was relatively recent in the sense that was given the image by Aquinas and his contemporaries, even his immediate predecessors. Their speculations on sacramental 'character' do not go back as far as Peter Lombard. With Augustine, therefore, as a remote predecessor in what turns out to have been a different use of the image, Aquinas wrote of a sacramental 'character' as comparable to the distinguishing mark, tattooed or branded on the soldiers of antiquity.<sup>102</sup> Aquinas did not imply that such marks were current in his day. Contemporary parallels were external signs such as, for instance, announced that a given knight served under a given commander or distinguished the knights serving under a king from those serving that king's enemy, in short, heraldic signs. Occasionally Aquinas made explicit reference to the battleflag,<sup>103</sup> but we shall not be wrong in thinking also of heraldic devices on the formerly white shield, of arms embroidered on the furnishings of 'caparisoned' horses, or on the surcoats adopted by mailed crusaders under the eastern sun. Neither Augustine nor Aquinas thought of sacramental character as a visible sign; for both it was interior and immaterial. For Augustine, as the late Nicholas Häring established, a character in the literal sense was a visible mark, the initials of an emperor's name, for instance, that permanently marked a soldier of the emperor, whether for honor or (should the

Patriarch, col. 197, no. 320; for letters mentioning Frederick's offense cols. 190, no. 309 (calendared only), 202, no. 332 (forma excommunicationis), and 211, 212, no. 350: 'Cum enim F. dictus imperator, confuso negotio Terrae sanctae cum Sarracenis et aliis infidelibus, ad conculcandam Romanam Ecclesiam et subvertendam ecclesiasticam libertatem ....'

<sup>102</sup> See the definitive study by N. Häring, 'St. Augustine's Use of the Word *Character*', *Mediaeval Studies* 14 (1952) 79-97, especially p. 83 where Häring set out the objectives of his study, 'Examining St. Augustine's works in their historical sequence ....' One result is the demonstration that the view of character entertained by Aquinas and his contemporaries is not that of Augustine; the text cited here, however, is from *ST* 3.63.1 in corp. 4.2829a): '... sicut milites qui adscribebantur ad militiam antiquitus solebant quibusdam characteribus corporalibus insigniri, eo quod deputabantur ad aliquid corporale.'

<sup>103</sup> '... gubernator non semper suggerit singulis ut suae voluntati obediant, sed proponit omnibus signum suae voluntatis, ad cuius sequelam aliqui excitantur inducti, alii propria sponte; sicut patet in duce exercitus, cuius vexillum sequuntur milites etiam nullo persuadente' (*ST* 3.8.7 ad 2 [4.2485a]) and 'Et ideo cum secundum ordinem agentium sive moventium sit ordo finium, necesse est quod ad ultimum finem convertatur homo per motionem primi moventis, ad finem autem proximum per motionem alicuius inferiorum moventium; sicut animus militis convertitur ad quaerendum victoriam ex motione ducis exercitus, ad sequendum autem vexillum alicuius aciei ex motione tribuni' (*ST* 1-2.109.6 in corp. [2.1357b]). The first is notable for the psychology of a knight, the second for both the appeal to the metaphysics of causes and for the mention of the lower level military officer, the 'tribune', acting under the superior officer, the 'duke'.

soldier defect) for dishonor. The element in baptism (and other sacraments, notably holy orders) with which Augustine associated such an invisible analogue is 'the Name of the Trinity', impressed or imprinted invisibly on the one baptized or ordained. It was in Augustinian terms, the 'title', the 'name', or the 'character', even the very baptism, not to be 'changed, undone, or destroyed by rebaptism'. It will be remembered that in the *Confessiones* (7.21.27) the bishop of Hippo had named the Lord *imperator*, 'emperor', and spoke of *fugitivis desertoribus*, 'fugitive deserters', as well. As Häring pointed out, 'Truly Augustinian equivalents for sacramental *character* in the modern sense <i.e., the post-Lombard meaning> are such expressions as *sacramentum*, *consecratio*, *sanctitas* or even *baptismus* and *ordinatio*.'<sup>104</sup>

Often enough, when Aquinas applied (or adjusted) the insight of Aristotle that many things may merit the same name thanks to their relation to something that is preeminently what the name conveys, his move entails no extraordinary metaphysical subtlety, but only a straightforward perception of a pattern by which various realities are related to a unifying characteristic. As usual Brother Thomas did not feel bound to stay with every detail of a text he was expounding and so, when explicating *Nicomachean Ethics* 1.6 (1096b29 ff.) in which Aristotle dealt with 'good', Aquinas used the parallel 'knightly', *militaris*. Thus he reminded his reader that Aristotle's 'good' was not to be confused with the Platonic separated Form 'for there is nothing common to them as a single common Idea of all goods'; so too 'knightly' does service as a single 'principle', verified in various ways of truly diverse realities which, nonetheless, are related intelligibly to that single principle and thus earn the common name. Something is said to be 'knightly' either because it is a knight's instrument (as is a sword), or because it is his protection (as is a cuirass), or his transportation (as is a horse).<sup>105</sup> Once more, Thomas Aquinas has

<sup>104</sup> Häring, 'St. Augustine's Use', 95.

<sup>105</sup> 'Quandoque quidem in hoc quod referuntur ad unum principium, sicut res aliqua dicitur militaris vel quia est instrumentum militis sicut gladius vel quia est tegumentum eius sicut lorica vel quia est vehiculum eius sicut equus' (*Sent. libri Ethicorum* 1.7 (1096b15 ff.) [47.27, ll. 181-185]), in which Aquinas sided with Aristotle against what both of them saw as a misleading notion of 'the Good' as a separated Form or Idea, to which Plato had made appeal. It might further be noted in this context, in which Aquinas has once more gratuitously introduced the military, that the term 'militaris' has also provoked a curious issue for the editors of the Latin Aristotle used by Aquinas: see L. J. Bataillon, 'Problèmes posés par l'édition critique des textes latins médiévaux', *Revue philosophique de Louvain* 75 (1977) 236: '... la vertu est plus profitable pour le succès que le vice, *κακία*. Moerbeke avait traduit ce dernier mot par *malitiam*, mais saint Thomas lisait dans son manuscrit *militiam* ....' This error in certain manuscripts of the *Politics* 2 (1271b8) thus engendered the necessity of reversed notices: Aristotle's text in the Leonine edition of the exposition by St. Thomas carried the *militiam* with a note in the apparatus that the term ought to be *malitiam* whereas in the edition of *Aristoteles latinus* the term *malitiam* in the text must be matched by *militiam* in the apparatus thanks to the two extant manuscripts with that error (Bataillon, p. 239). Dr. Claude Lafleur pointed out this discussion by Bataillon to me.

chosen, with no compulsion from his text, to illustrate a philosophically significant turn of speech with military lore common to his readers and to himself.

Not unlike this analogical use of the term 'knightly' is the interpretation which came to the mind of Aquinas when faced with 'the Book of Life' mentioned in the deuterocanonical Ecclesiasticus 24:32: 'All these are "the Book of Life"'. Aquinas argued on several grounds that the expression is a metaphor which refers to predestination and in securing this interpretation he used as a parallel 'the book of the militia', *liber militiae*, perhaps better translated as 'the knightly book'. Such a book might be one in which the names of those chosen for military service are transcribed, or it can be one in which the art of war is transmitted (the *De re militari* of Vegetius could have served Aquinas as an instance of this genre), or it might be a book in which the feats achieved by knights are recounted, perhaps such writings as constitute the 'Arthurian cycle'.<sup>106</sup>

A parallel and equally gratuitous appeal to military matters was made by Aquinas in another theological-exegetical context, the issue of 'testing' whether by the Lord, as in the 'testing' of Abraham's faith, or by the Adversary's 'testing' of us all. One aspect of such testing Aquinas held to be 'a showing forth' of what the one tested truly is and this, even though the agency testing be a non-cognitive one. Thus the unknowing flesh, or the unknowing, seductive 'world' can test and thus show forth the truth on saint or sinner. To clarify his meaning, Brother Thomas pointed out that 'in combat the courage of a knight is known, even though enemies fight, not to know, but to conquer'.<sup>107</sup>

Before the courage of a knight is tested in combat, his duty will be to prepare for that ordeal. In his habitually concrete way, Aquinas specified paradigmatic instances of that preparation: 'It belongs to a knight's strength ... not only to unsheath the sword, but to sharpen it as well'.<sup>108</sup> Once more there is a hint of mild cynicism on knights and knighthood in the way Thomas adjusted Aristotle's examples of pursuits so dear to us that we wish to share them with the like-minded. Aristotle's drinking, dicing, athletics, hunting and philosophizing became in the *Scriptum* of Aquinas no more than 'According to the Philosopher, that in which one is mainly preoccupied is "the life" for each one, as is fighting for a knight and

<sup>106</sup> 'Sicut etiam liber militiae potest dici, vel in quo scribuntur electi ad militiam, vel in quo traditur ars militaris, vel in quo recitantur facta militum' (*ST* 1.24.1 ad 1 [l. 169a]); this counts as a gratuitous illustration of the scriptural 'Book of Life' by one of three candidates for the designation 'military book', 'knightly book'.

<sup>107</sup> 'Alia vero tentatio est in qua salvatur unum tantum dictorum, scilicet manifestatio tentati, et sic dicitur caro tentare, vel mundus: quia in his cognoscitur manifeste virtus vel infirmitas mentis, sicut in bello cognoscitur virtus militis, quamvis hostes non impugnent ut cognoscant, sed ut vincant; unde ipsa impugnatio virtutis tentatio dicitur' (*In 2 Sent.* 21.1.1 Solut. [2.526]).

<sup>108</sup> '... ad fortitudinem militis pertinet non solum exserere gladium in hostes, sed etiam exacuere gladium et in vagina conservare' (*ST* 2-2.117.3 ad 2 [3.2015b]).



drinking for a drunkard'.<sup>109</sup> He added to Aristotle's 'drinking' only the 'fighting' of a knight; all the rest are omitted and all the omitted are innocent occupations whereas drinking and fighting can easily slide over into excess. In his *Sententiae* on the same passage in the *Nicomachean Ethics* there is also a military expansion, but linked to a more faithful following of the text. There, acknowledging Aristotle's point that what one sees as that which 'constitutes existence, or which makes life pleasant' will entail sharing it with friends, Thomas expanded one of Aristotle's illustrations. 'Exercising together', συγγυμνάζονται, became more precise: 'in tournaments, in wrestling-bouts, and in other such' doings.<sup>110</sup>

### TOURNAMENTS AND DUELS

Knights preparing for combat engaged in the dangerous sport of jousting and on this the Church was not indifferent. Thus Aquinas included among the contrary arguments he felt he must refute the statement: 'the combat exercises which take place in tournaments are prohibited by the Church, for those who die in such beginners' activities are deprived of Christian burial'. This argument was intended to establish that to wage war is always sinful. To this argument the son and brother of professional warriors responded with a distinction and a sidelong glance at antiquity when, he had been assured by reading Jerome, the perilous jousting of the Middle Ages had not occurred. Such exercises were not universally prohibited by the Church in his day, Aquinas noted, but only 'the excessive and dangerous ones from which killings and depredations proceed'.<sup>111</sup> In the absence of every detail except the pope's intervention for the release of his brother Aimo, held for ransom on Cyprus, it cannot be stated that Aimo had come to grief in a tournament. Still, it is hard to imagine any other explanation for why a crusader, returning honorably from the Holy Land, should have been held for ransom by a Christian noble and that the reigning pope should have intervened for his release. If that hypothesis be made, then the pope saw this as a 'depredation' and did what

<sup>109</sup> 'Secundum PHILOSOPHUM in IX *Eth.*, (12.1172<sup>a</sup>, 1 sq.; l. 14, d.) illud dicitur esse uniuscujusque vita in quo maxime studet, sicut militis in pugnando et ebriosi in potando; unde et in talibus ad amicos convivere volunt' (*In 3 Sent.* 35.1.1 Sed in contrarium [3.1172]).

<sup>110</sup> Where Aristotle, in the Latin Aquinas used, had written 'coexercitantur' Brother Thomas thought it right to enlarge the verb with an example: '... quidam autem simul exercitari, puta in torneamentis, luctationibus et aliis huiusmodi ...' (*Sent. libri Ethicorum* 9.12 (1172a1-9) [47<sup>2</sup>.548, ll. 3-8]); for the remarks of Aquinas on this pericope, see *ibid.*, p. 549.51-52.

<sup>111</sup> '... exercitia bellorum, quae sunt in torneamentis, prohibentur ab Ecclesia, quia morientes in huiusmodi tyrociniis ecclesiastica sepultura privantur ...' is the argument to which Aquinas responded with the distinction: '... exercitia hominum ad res bellicas spectantia non sunt universaliter prohibita; sed inordinata exercitia et periculosa, ex quibus occisiones et depredationes proveniunt' (*ST* 2-2.40.1 arg. 4 and ad 4 [3.1632b, 1633b]).

he could in favor of a family, the support of whom could be crucial in the continuing conflict between pope and emperor.

Preparing for successful warfare includes more than sharpening one's sword and practicing in tournaments for combat. It must embrace military planning. Strategy and tactics so largely employ deception and ambushing that the classic treatise on the subject, the *De strategematibus* by Frontinus, was known and used by Aquinas.<sup>112</sup> As a theologian he was obliged to weigh the morality of such devices and his severity on lies, not only 'malicious' ones, but also 'useful' and even 'jocose' lies,<sup>113</sup> does not prepare us for his willingness to justify deception in warfare. Since he saw no reason to forbid lawyers 'to employ such tricks' he was willing (must one not suppose *a pari*?) to 'allow a knight to fight from ambush'.<sup>114</sup>

On 'duels' the texts of Aquinas make complicated demands on his reader. To begin, speaking explicitly of 'one who watches a duel with interest', *ille qui circumspicit duellum*, he dealt with a term in the text of Aristotle transliterated rather than translated in his Latin version and, in consequence, misleading. That key term is ὑποκριτής, in Latin *ypocrita*; on it Aquinas rightly commented, 'that is, wearing a simulated personality', *id est simulatam gerens personam*. Aristotle had introduced the actor, the ὑποκριτής, and the athlete as instances of rivals on whose success their partisans might 'wish' but not 'choose'. Aquinas, however, illustrated this with a "boxer" who might not be a boxer, thus shifting the intent of the Philosopher from the masked actor in a dramatic competition to an incompetent athlete masquerading as a genuine one. Hence, the pseudo-athlete is an instantiation of 'hypocrite' in the pejorative sense. All Aristotle's text intended was to discriminate between 'choosing' among options that lie under our power and 'wishing for' an outcome that does not lie within our scope. Spectators do not choose the outcome of an athletic competition, friends do no more than wish for the victory of the actor they support in a dramatic competition. Aquinas has evidently caught this distinction, but it is less fortunate that he calls such compe-

<sup>112</sup> '... Unde inter caetera documenta rei militaris hoc praecipue ponitur de occultandis consiliis ne ad hostes perveniant, ut patet in libro *Strategematibus* Frontini. Et talis occultatio pertinet ad rationem insidiarum quibus licitum est uti in bellis iustis' (ST 2-2.40.3 in corp. [3.1636a]); it may be noted that older editors, less familiar than was Aquinas with military authors, garbled the name 'Frontinus' and rendered it 'Francorum'.

<sup>113</sup> See ST 2-2.110.3 'Utrum omne mendacium sit peccatum', a question he answered affirmatively, but followed by one, ST 2-2.110.4 'Utrum omne mendacium sit peccatum mortale', which he answered with a denial (3.1994b and 1996b).

<sup>114</sup> See ST 2-2.71.3 ad 3 where, in the course of debating 'Utrum advocatus peccet si iniustam causam defendit', Aquinas distinguished in dealing with the argument 'Sed videtur advocato licere talibus astutiis uti, sicut militi licet ex insidiis pugnare' between the situation in which a lawyer begins an unjust case in good conscience, but becomes aware of his client's guilt in the course of the legal process — such a lawyer can and ought 'prudenter occultare ea quibus impediri posset processus eius' and in this would be a parallel to the legitimate military use of ambush (3.1794a and b).

titions 'duels' and that the blameless Greek 'actor' with his normal actor's mask has prompted him to illustrate 'hypocrite' by a pseudo-boxer, *quasi pugil cum non sit pugil*.<sup>115</sup> Their 'duel' is hardly a duel.

For Aquinas did condemn roundly the true 'duel', but here too there is an ambiguity. His condemnation is not owing to the immoral acceptance in advance by all principals of what is tantamount to suicide and murder; his objections stem from opposition to the mediaeval abuse of justice in the 'trial by combat', not from a rejection of the murderous conception of personal 'honor' that for so long led to individual warfare.

In one passage Aquinas opined that the 'custom of duels' had arisen from an irrational and therefore pseudo-law from ancient times. Should one suspected of homicide take flight in the presence of a 'multitude of witnesses' (pursued by a relative of the victim), the fugitive would be accounted guilty. Presumably the accused could engage in a duel to clear his name; in any case, Aquinas scouted the custom as 'altogether irrational' and used it to support his general contention that old laws ought not to be the guide in formulating new ones; social good ought to command legislators.<sup>116</sup> By 'duel' Aquinas intended the trial by combat forbidden by Church and law and he considered the practice a superstition, that is, an illicit attempt to gain knowledge of what is hidden through an abuse of religion. The outcome of a duel could reveal such information only by a divine or by a diabolic intervention, for combat as such normally ends in favor of the combatant whose 'art or strength' is superior.<sup>117</sup> In the relatively late *Summa theologiae* Aquinas condemned 'judgment by hot iron or by boiling water' as expecting 'some miraculous effect from God'; to use such procedures to extort a confession of guilt

<sup>115</sup> Aristotle's text, *NE* 3.3 (1111b20-25), as Aquinas had it before him, read: 'Electio quidem enim non est impossibile, et, si quis dicat eligi, videbitur utique insipiens esse. Voluntas autem est impossibile, puta immortalitatis. Et voluntas quidem est circa ea quae nequaquam per ipsum operata sunt utique, puta ypocritam aliquem vincere vel athletam.' On this Aquinas commented: '*Et voluntas quidem est* etc. Quae talis est. Voluntas alicuius potest esse circa ea quae non fiunt per ipsum; sicut ille qui circumspicit duellum potest velle quod vincat aliquis ypocrita, id est simulatam gerens personam, puta qui ingreditur campum quasi pugil cum non sit pugil, vel etiam quod vincat ille qui vere est athleta. Sed nullus eligit talia quae fiunt per alium, sed solum illa quae aestimat posse fieri per ipsum' (*Sent. libri Ethicorum* 3.3 (1111b20-25) [47.131-34, ll. 20-25 for the Aristotle passage and ll. 166-174 for that of Aquinas]).

<sup>116</sup> 'Et similiter videmus quod si quae leges adhuc remanent de antiquis, sunt omnia stulta; sicut in quadam terra erat talis lex circa homicidia, quod si aliquis de cognatis occisi persequeretur homicidam et ille fugeret presente multitudine testium, quod ille reputaretur reus homicidii (et ab hinc videtur introducta consuetudo duellorum): et hoc est omnino irrationabile. Homines autem in legibus ponendis non debent querere quid fuerit a patribus observatum, sed quid sit bonum observandum; et ita conveniens est antiquas leges mutare, si occurrant meliores' (*Sent. libri Politicorum* 2.12 (1268b38 ff.) [48.A 160, ll. 70-81]).

<sup>117</sup> 'Vnde etiam duella ad hoc videntur pertinere, nisi inquantum per artem vel virtutem plerumque unus alium superat' (*De sortibus* 3 [43.231-32, ll. 86-88]).

had been explicitly condemned, 'and the same argument seems to apply to the law on duels'. Still, Brother Thomas had a reservation: 'unless there is no expectation of a miraculous effect' when, of course, the crime of 'tempting God' does not apply. Nor would a patently onesided fight fall under that condemnation: 'the combatants, *pugiles*, are very unequal in strength or in art'.<sup>118</sup> This late witness from the *Summa* is but a more extensive presentation of what the young Aquinas had put more succinctly in his *Scriptum*: 'In the casting of lots and in judgments which come to pass through fire and water, or through a duel, a divine testimony is expected ... a kind of "testing" of God!'<sup>119</sup>

### HUNTING

As has been seen, hunting was included by Aristotle among the occupations that devotees wish to share with their friends. This had its parallel in mediaeval knighthood, particularly in the sport of falconry and hawking. The sometime overlord of the Aquinas family, Frederick II, had written a full-scale treatise on the subject,<sup>120</sup> but Aquinas has noted only a few points in his *Exposition of Job* where Job 39:13 invited him to do so. Brother Thomas there informed his readers that 'the most noble' sort of falcon is the one called a *girfalcus*. Both the gerfalcon and that 'well-known bird, the *accipiter*', our hawk, are birds characterized by excellence of flight.<sup>121</sup> Unlike the eagle, falcons and hawks eat only living prey; Aquinas noted that it was the young of the eagle who are represented in the Book of Job 39:30 as those who 'lick blood' from cadavers brought to them in the nest, and went on to the line echoed by both Mt 24:28 and Lc 17:37 – 'wherever a cadaver might be, there <the eagle> is immediately present'.<sup>122</sup> Modern translations,

<sup>118</sup> 'Ferri candentis vel aquae ferventis examinatione confessionem extorqueri a quolibet, sacri non censent canones ... eadem ratio videtur esse de lege duellorum, nisi quod plus accedit ad communem rationem sortium, inquantum non expectatur ibi miraculosus effectus; nisi forte quando pugiles sunt valde impares virtute vel arte' (ST 2-2.95.8 ad 3 [3.1925b]).

<sup>119</sup> 'In sortibus et iudiciis quae fiunt per ignem et aquam vel per duellum, exspectatur divinum testimonium; et propter hoc sunt prohibita, quia in his videtur esse quaedam Dei tentatio' (*In 3 Sent.* 39.2 q1a. 2 [3.1286]).

<sup>120</sup> This is the *De arte venandi cum avibus* by Frederick II extant in two manuscript traditions, one in two books, the other in six. For the full text in English translation see *The Art of Falconry*, trans. and ed. C. A. Wood and F. M. Fyfe (Stanford, 1943); see also the facsimile edition of ms. Vatican Library Pal. lat. 1071 (two books, additions by Manfred, son of Frederick), 2 vols. (Codices e Vaticanis selecti 16; Graz, 1969).

<sup>121</sup> '... *Penna strutionis similis est pennis herodii*, idest nobilissimi falconis qui girfalcus dicitur, et *accipitris*, qui est avis nota, et ambae sunt aves boni volatus' (*Exp. super Iob* 39:13 [26.210, ll. 163-166]).

<sup>122</sup> '... *Pulli eius lambunt sanguinem*, scilicet animalium viventium quae aquila ad nidum defert. Pascitur autem aquila non solum animalibus vivis sicut falcones et accipitres, sed etiam cadaveribus animalium mortuorum, unde subdit *et ubicumque cadaver fuerit statim adest*' (ibid. 39:30 [p. 212.319-324]).

correctly it must be thought, take the αἰτός of Septuagint (Job 39:27) and the Gospel (Mt 24:28, Lc 17:37) αἰετοί to be 'vulture(s)' rather than 'eagle(s)', but Aquinas had *aquila* before him. In any event, what is of interest here is that he wrote knowledgeably of falcons and of hawks, the birds used habitually in hunting. For instance, the Book of Job 39:26 refers to the feathering of the hawk: 'through divine wisdom the bird spreads her wings to the south'. Aquinas saw in this line evidence of what he counted the underlying theme of the Book of Job, divine Providence. In his exposition he expanded the biblical verse with what he knew of moulting birds. At the proper moment, 'the time of moulting', the hawk shows an 'inborn industry' and spreads her wings to the south wind, which, of course, is 'a warm wind'. Her instinctive purpose, the inborn drive to do this, effects that 'with pores open', presumably owing to the warm south wind, 'old feathers fall away and new ones are reborn'.<sup>123</sup> This is a reference to the appearance of a new pattern in the plumage, traverse rather than vertical markings. Every detail of these remarks seems to be in harmony with what is stated by modern experts on falconry and hawking; the ease with which Aquinas brought them into his exegesis of incidental statements in the Book of Job confirms the impression that he was imbued with information on the preoccupation of his knightly class with hunting.

#### GROUNDS AND CONSEQUENCES

Scholars have not been wrong to account for the professional theological persona of St. Thomas Aquinas by assigning first place to Latin traditions of biblical exegesis, to Greek philosophical and theological conceptions, to ecclesial praxis as mediated by councils and by popes. His easy acquaintance with the profession of arms must count as relatively minor when set against his Dominican spirituality or against the theological erudition available to him thanks to 'authors', *authentica*, and 'masters', *magistralia*, all appropriated by his independent and discriminating intelligence.<sup>124</sup>

Still, to see this towering figure in the concrete human circumstances through which his learning and sanctity received their unique shape and through which that erudite holiness was communicated to his contemporaries is not without value for us. The editor of the letter that Brother Thomas addressed to Abbot Bernard

<sup>123</sup> '... et primo commemorat naturalem industriam accipitris qui tempore mutationis pennarum expandit alas suas ad austrum, qui est ventus calidus, ut apertis poris veteres pennae decidant et novae renascantur, unde dicit *Numquid per sapientiam tuam plumescit accipiter*, scilicet quando pennae eius renovantur, *expandens alas suas ad austrum*, ut scilicet facilius pennas mutet?' (ibid. 39:26 [p. 211.288-295]).

<sup>124</sup> See M.-D. Chenu, '*Authentica et Magistralia*, deux lieux théologiques aux XII-XIII siècles', *Divus Thomas* (Piacenza) 28 (1925) 257-85 and E. A. Synan, 'Brother Thomas, the Master, and the Masters' in *Commemorative Studies* 2.219-42.

Ayglier of Monte Cassino, cited above, has reminded us that we are too poor not to cherish whatever information can be acquired on the 'private' Brother Thomas:

Too often we forget, when it is a matter of non-academic or non-religious facts in the life of St. Thomas, that we know next to nothing, at least, very few things .... Of that 'private Brother Thomas', should we dare so to speak, we are ignorant of nearly everything. So too, the verisimilitude of the rare data we have merits our attention and our welcome, provided those data are not given the lie by more certainly established facts ....<sup>125</sup>

Like Torah, the works of Aquinas 'speak the language of men'.<sup>126</sup> Literary expression depends in part upon the way in which reality is perceived and transmuted in an author's imagination; it depends in part upon what areas of reality have been perceived. Comparisons and parallels and examples are intended to render intelligible to readers matters otherwise obscure or opaque. Theological doctrines deal with the mysterious whereas in the thirteenth century knights and knighthood were well known. Over and over we have witnessed spontaneous references to knightly attitudes or convictions or equipment by St. Thomas; his discourse at such points will hit the mark with us precisely to the point that we have appropriated his personal formation in a knightly family and the consequences this entailed.

His references that tell us most are those qualified above as 'gratuitous', that is to say, illustrations or examples on issues that in no way require analogies drawn from military sources. Those analogies often are military, however, and thus they reveal the mentality of this preaching friar; his mentality in turn stems from his social class and rearing.

If the military family background of Aquinas hardly rivals the textual erudition that marks his theological and philosophical work, it cannot be ignored as the influence that prompted him to think of small-boys-learning-to-be-knights as a parallel to small-boys-learning-to-be-clerks-or-friars. Nor is it irrelevant that, in making this point, Brother Thomas appealed to the best military manual that had reached the Middle Ages from antiquity, the *Epitome de re militari* of Renatus Vegetius. As much can be said of his calling upon the *De strategematibus* by Frontinus when required to deal with the morality of deceptions inseparable from

<sup>125</sup> 'Nous oublions trop souvent, lorsqu'il s'agit de faits non scolaires ou religieux de la vie de saint Thomas, que nous ne savons presque rien, du moins fort peu de choses .... De ce frère Thomas privé, si nous osons dire, nous ignorons presque tout. Aussi bien, la vraisemblance des quelques rares informations que nous possédons mérite notre attention et notre accueil, quand elles ne sont pas démenties par des faits plus sûrs' (Dondaine, Introduction, *Epist. ad Bernardum abbatem* [Leonine edition 42.405]).

<sup>126</sup> Aphorism from the *Babylonian Talmud*, Baba Mez'ia 31b, cited by Rabbi Moses ben Maimon, *Guide for the Perplexed* 26, 29, and 33, a work well known to Aquinas in Latin translation.

the military art, the general's ambush or even, one may think, the swordsman's feint.

One would be ill-advised to go to Aquinas for systematic information on knighthood in the Middle Ages, to be sure, but his incidental remarks have been seen to be compatible with what modern specialists have established when they have dealt with the same themes. Brother Thomas had the enormous advantage of direct observation, of discussions in a family of knights, discussions in which he had participated or at least had overheard. He lived through the harsh experiences such as must be expected to accompany military life: his brother Aimo captured and held for ransom after surviving the perils of the Crusade, the cruel execution of another brother, the very Rinaldo who had been guilty of the outrageous kidnapping intended to frustrate the Dominican vocation of Thomas. The Common Doctor has been widely and deservedly accepted as a quintessential theologian and preaching friar; he was also *miles occasionatus*, a *chevalier manqué*.

BERKELEY, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,  
BANCROFT LIBRARY MS. 2  
(NOTES DE LECTURE)

*Édouard Jeuneau*

LES 20 et 21 novembre 1978, au cours d'un voyage en Californie, j'ai eu la possibilité de passer quelques heures dans le département des manuscrits de la bibliothèque de l'Université Berkeley. Mon attention fut attirée par le manuscrit suivant: Berkeley, University of California, Bancroft Library 2. Il s'agit d'un volume de modestes dimensions (232 × 140 mm.) comprenant 72 folios de parchemin. L'écriture est du <sup>xiii</sup><sup>e</sup> siècle selon toute apparence, mais il n'est pas impossible que les folios 54-59<sup>v</sup> aient été écrits au <sup>xii</sup><sup>e</sup>. Dans la marge inférieure du folio 54, trois distiques élégiaques ont été transcrits par une main du <sup>xiv</sup><sup>e</sup> siècle. A la marge inférieure du folio 1, on trouve cette marque de possession: *Di Aless(andro) Padoani*,<sup>1</sup> et, au-dessous, une ancienne cote: N.43. Au dos de la reliure (<sup>xviii</sup><sup>e</sup> s.), on remarque le blason (une chouette et trois étoiles) des Locatelli (famille de Bergame). Le manuscrit a fait partie de la collection Phillipps (n° 9592). Les notes que j'ai prises sur place, il y a bientôt dix ans, ne me permettant pas de donner une description paléographique et codicologique complète,<sup>2</sup> je me contenterai ici d'analyser le contenu de ce volume.

Notons d'abord qu'une erreur de reliure a placé le dernier feuillet du cahier A après le premier feuillet du cahier B. Pour restaurer la continuité du texte, il faut et il suffit de lire les folios dans l'ordre suivant: 9, 11, 10, 12 (numérotation moderne, en bas de page). Par ailleurs, les folios 28 et 29 (pagination ancienne) ont été arrachés. La foliotation moderne n'en a pas tenu compte: l'ancien folio 30 devient le folio 28. De plus, dans la foliotation ancienne, deux folios étaient restés sans numérotation: le premier se situe entre les folios 31 et 32, le second entre les folios 38 et 39. L'attribution du numéro 30 au premier, et du numéro 38 au second permet à la foliotation moderne de rattraper la foliotation ancienne. Du folio 39 au folio 53 inclus, ces deux foliotations coïncident. A partir du folio 54, la

<sup>1</sup> Alessandro Pado[v]ani, médecin de Forlì (xvii<sup>e</sup> s.), a laissé sa marque de possession dans les manuscrits suivants: Londres, British Library Add. 17984; New York, Columbia University, Butler Library Plimpton 180; Vatican, Vat. lat. 9952.

<sup>2</sup> Pour plus de détails, cf. *Bibliotheca philippica. Medieval Manuscripts: New Series: Second Part*.... Day of Sale: Tuesday 29 November 1966. Sotheby & Co., lot 48.



foliotation ancienne disparaît. Dans ce qui suit, on se référera toujours à la foliotation moderne.

Bien que le manuscrit, dans son ensemble, ait été copié au <sup>xiii</sup><sup>e</sup> siècle, les textes qu'il renferme appartiennent, par la lettre comme par l'esprit, au <sup>xii</sup><sup>e</sup> siècle, voire à la première moitié du <sup>xii</sup><sup>e</sup> siècle. On peut y distinguer sept unités.

# I

ff. 1-27v: GUILLAUME DE CONCHES, *Philosophia* (Texte remanié)

Dans les folios 1-27v du manuscrit de Berkeley nous trouvons une version remaniée de la *Philosophia* de Guillaume de Conches. Le début (ff. 1-8v) coïncide avec le texte édité par Carmelo Ottaviano,<sup>3</sup> texte établi à partir de trois manuscrits: Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana N 59 sup.; Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek CIm 18215 et 23529. On peut en citer trois autres: Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana 77.2; Valenciennes, Bibliothèque Municipale 321; Vatican, Reg. lat. 358, ff. 70v-71. Ce dernier manuscrit ne contient, en réalité, que quelques extraits.<sup>4</sup> La suite du texte (ff. 8v-27v) correspond à la rédaction brève de la *Philosophia* de Guillaume de Conches, telle qu'on peut la lire en PL 172 ou, mieux encore, dans l'édition de Gregor Maurach.<sup>5</sup> Voici quelques points de repère:

f. 1: Potissimum uniuersorum expetendorum est sapientia, per quam perfecta omnium bonorum acquiritur forma. Siquidem ... (Ottaviano, p. 19)

f. 5, lin. 10-11: ... ut de gallo qui trahit trabem. (Ottaviano, p. 36.19)

f. 5, lin. 12: Quamuis docendi studiis impeditus ... (Ottaviano, p. 36.22)

f. 8v, lin. 32: ... per equales diuidi partes. (Ottaviano, p. 52.30)

f. 8v, lin. 33: Hactenus de [h]illis que sunt et non uidentur nostra disseruit oratio. Nunc ad ea ... (Maurach, p. 26; PL 172.48c10)

f. 12, lin. 25: Ergo in tempore anni in quo maximus calor, id est estate, facta est mundi creatio. (Maurach, p. 40; PL 172.58a11)

f. 12, lin. 26-f. 12v, lin. 5: Tables des chapitres du livre suivant.

f. 12v, lin. 6: In superioribus de his que sunt et non uidentur et de elementis ... (Maurach, p. 4; PL 172.58b2)

f. 18v, lin. 9: ... que ibi semper apparet. (Maurach, p. 72; PL 172.76a3)

f. 18v, lin. 10-18: Table des chapitres du livre suivant.

<sup>3</sup> C. Ottaviano, *Un brano inedito della «Philosophia» di Guglielmo di Conches* (Naples, 1935).

<sup>4</sup> *Codices Regimenses latini*, t. 2: *Codices 251-500*, recensuit A. Wilmart (Vatican, 1945), p. 335. On notera qu'au folio 70r-v du Reg. lat. 358 se trouvent également des extraits du *Didascalicon* de Hugues de Saint-Victor.

<sup>5</sup> *Wilhelm von Conches, Philosophia*, herausgegeben, übersetzt und kommentiert von G. Maurach (Pretoria, 1980).

- f. 18v, lin. 19: Etsi studiis docendi occupati parum spatii ... (Maurach, p. 73; PL 172.75A)
- f. 22, lin. 3: ... humidumque crescit, et inde fluctus usque ad nouilunium. (Maurach, p. 87; PL 172.84c10)
- f. 22, lin. 4-16: Table des chapitres du livre suivant.
- f. 22, lin. 17: Superiorum uoluminum series a prima causa rerum orta ... (Maurach, p. 88; PL 172.83D2)
- f. 27v, dernière ligne: ... ad cetera discenda accedat, hic IIII particule longitudinem terminemus. (Maurach, p. 116; PL 172.102A7)

## II

### f. 28-28v: HUGUES DE SAINT-VICTOR, *Préface du Didascalicon*

Au recto et au verso du folio 28 se trouve la version longue de la préface du *Didascalicon* de Hugues de Saint-Victor. On peut y distinguer trois parties, que l'on désignera par les lettres *A*, *B*, *C*.

(*A*) f. 28, lin. 1-23: Tribus modis res subsistere habent: in actu, in intellectu, in mente diuina, hoc est, in ratione diuina .... «factum est ita» ad intellectum angelorum; «et fecit Deus» ad actum rerum.

(*B*) f. 28, lin. 24-f. 28v, lin. 13: Multi sunt quos ipsa adeo natura ingenio destitutos reliquit .... sic profecto turpius est uigere ingenio, diuitiis affluere, et torpere otio.

(*C*) f. 28v, lin. 14-33: Due precipue res sunt quibus quisque ad scientiam instruitur .... ad ultimum docet illum qui propter amorem scientie eam legit, et sic secunda quoque pars finem accipit.

Les paragraphes *B* (PL 176.770C-771B) et *C* (PL 176.741A-C) forment la préface de l'édition de Charles Henry Buttimer.<sup>6</sup> Le paragraphe *A* a été publié par le même éditeur en appendice au *Didascalicon*.<sup>7</sup> On sait que ce paragraphe présente certaines ressemblances avec un traité de Robert Grosseteste.<sup>8</sup> Par ailleurs, les idées qui y sont exposées sont voisines de celles que l'on rencontre dans des *Quaestiones* de Hugues de Saint-Victor qu'a éditées Dom Odon Lottin.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>6</sup> *Hugonis de sancto Victore Didascalicon. De studio legendi. A Critical Text ...* by C. H. Buttimer (Washington, D. C., 1939), pp. 1-3.

<sup>7</sup> *ibid.*, pp. 134-35.

<sup>8</sup> P. O. Lewry, «Robert Grosseteste's Question on Subsistence: An Echo of the Adamites» dans *Mediaeval Studies* 45 (1983) 1-21.

<sup>9</sup> «Tribus modis res esse dicuntur .... euentuum earum» (O. Lottin, «Questions inédites de Hugues de Saint-Victor» dans *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 26 [1959] 184-85).

## III

ff. 29-53v: HUGUES DE SAINT-VICTOR, *Didascalicon*

f. 29: DIDASCALICON VGNIS DE STVDIO LEGENDI LIBER I DE ORIGINE ARTIS INCIPIT.

Omnium expetendorum prima est sapientia, in qua perfecti boni forma consistit ... (Buttimer, p. 4; PL 176.741c11)

f. 53v: ... et illuminare nobis in semitis suis ut introducat uos ad puram et sine animalibus cenam. (Buttimer, p. 130.14; PL 176.809b15)

EXPLICIT DI<DASCALICON> VGNIS

La fin du traité (Buttimer, pp. 130-33; PL 176.809c-812b) fait défaut dans le manuscrit de Berkeley.

## IV

ff. 54-59v: *Florilège patristique*

Le thème de ce petit traité est l'enfer, non point celui où sont châtiés les pécheurs, mais celui où les âmes des justes de l'Ancien Testament attendaient que le Christ vînt les délivrer.<sup>10</sup> L'opuscule comprend deux parties:

1° Exposé de la question et énoncé de la solution (f. 54-f. 55, lin. 15)

2° Dossier patristique (f. 55, lin. 15-f. 59v).

La première partie est introduite par ces paroles, empruntées au Livre de Job (14:13): «Quis mihi tribuat ut in inferno protegas me?» De quel enfer Job veut-il parler? Il ne peut s'agir de l'enfer où sont punis les damnés. Il faut, en effet, distinguer deux enfers: l'enfer d'en-haut (*superiora inferni loca*) et l'enfer d'en-bas (*inferiora inferni loca*). C'est dans ce dernier que les méchants sont torturés. Le premier est celui dans lequel l'âme de Job et celles de tous les justes de l'Ancien Testament attendaient l'heure de leur délivrance. Car l'homme, qui avait péché seul, ne pouvait se libérer seul. Il ne pouvait faire retour au paradis que si le Christ-Médiateur lui en ouvrait le chemin et écartait le glaive de flamme qui lui en interdisait l'entrée.

<sup>10</sup> H. Quilliet, «Descente de Jésus aux enfers» dans *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* 4.565-619; P. Callon, «Descente du Christ aux enfers» dans *Catholicisme hier, aujourd'hui, demain* 3.658-61; J. D. Quinn-J. H. Rohling-P. Verdier, «Descent of Christ into Hell» dans *New Catholic Encyclopedia* 4.788-93; A. Grillmeier, «Höllenabstieg Christi, Höllenfahrt Christi» dans *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche* 5.450-55. Le numéro 87 (mars-avril 1968) de la revue *Lumière et vie* est consacré à cet article du Symbole des Apôtres. Par ailleurs, M. Zbigniew Izydorczyk a défendu en 1985 devant l'Université de Toronto une thèse de doctorat intitulée: *The Legend of the Harrowing of Hell in Middle English Literature*.

En fait, cette première partie n'a rien d'original. C'est un collage de cinq textes, extraits des *Moralia in Iob* de saint Grégoire le Grand. Voici l'incipit et l'explicit de chacun de ces extraits.<sup>11</sup>

- (1) f. 54, lin. 1-38: Quis mihi tribuat ... in quo recorderis mei.  
(Grégoire le Grand, *Moralia in Iob* XII, IX, 13-XI, 15 [CCL 143A.636-38])
- (2) f. 54v, lin. 1-18: Sed ecce quod auctoris nostri ... tenebras uocat.  
(ibid. XIII, XLIII, 48, lin. 8-XLIV, 49 [p. 694])
- (3) f. 54v, lin. 18-f. 55, lin. 2: In profundissimum infernum descendent ... quietem retributionis inuenit.  
(ibid. XIII, XLVIII, 53-54 [pp. 696-97])
- (4) f. 55, lin. 2-7: Sed sunt nonnulli ... quisquis haec sapit.  
(ibid. XVIII, XL, 63, lin. 77-85 [p. 929])
- (5) f. 55, lin. 7-15: Scio quia morti ... conditione pertransiit.  
(ibid. XX, XXXIV, 66, lin. 1-13 [p. 1052]).

La seconde partie (dossier patristique) est un recueil de citations attribuées aux auteurs suivants:

- (1) IERONYMVS (texte transcrit ci-dessous); (2) AVGVSTINVS, *De resurrectione Domini*;
- (3) GREGORIVS, in homilia «Cum natus esset Iesus»; (4) IOHANNES CRISOSTOMVS; (5) AMBROSIVS, *Epistula de consolatione Valentiniani*; (6) ORIGENES; (7) AVGVSTINVS, *Epistula ad Leucianum*;<sup>12</sup> (8) AVGVSTINVS, *Super symbolum, de ordinatione cleri*; (9) IERONYMVS, in *Leuitico*; (10) GREGORIVS PAPA, *De gradibus cognationum*; (11) AVGVSTINVS, *De baptismo*; (12) AVGVSTINVS, in *Retractionibus*; (13) AVGVSTINVS, *Epistula ad Leucianum*;<sup>13</sup> (14) AVGVSTINVS, *Ad Vincentium*; (15) AVGVSTINVS, *De fide*; (16) AVGVSTINVS, in *libro psalorum*; (17) AVGVSTINVS, in *libro III de doctrina christiana*; (18) AVGVSTINVS, *De catechizandis rudibus*; (19) AMBROSIVS; (20) IERONYMVS, *Epistula ad Iouianum*;<sup>14</sup> (21) AVGVSTINVS, *De sancta uirginitate*; (22) AVGVSTINVS, in *II de doctrina christiana*; (23) AVGVSTINVS, *Epistula ad Hyreneum*; (24) AVGVSTINVS, *Super Iohannem*; (25) AMBROSIVS, in *Libro de officio*; (26) AVGVSTINVS, in *Libro sententiarum Prosperi*; (27) GREGORIVS, in *omelia pascale*; (28) AVGVSTINVS, in *expositione psalmi LIII*; (29) IERONYMVS, in *Epistula ad Ephesios*; (30) AVGVSTINVS, in *Libro sententiarum Prosperi*; (31) AVGVSTINVS, *De Trinitate*; (32) AVGVSTINVS, in *sententiarum Prosperi*; (33) AMBROSIVS, in *Epistula ad Ebreos*; (34) AVGVSTINVS; (35) AMBROSIVS, *De eodem*; (36) AVGVSTINVS, *De ciuitate Dei* (texte transcrit ci-dessous).

Il n'est pas dans mes intentions de donner une analyse complète de ce florilège patristique. Je me contenterai de recopier le premier et le dernier des textes cités:

<sup>11</sup> Je remercie vivement mes collègues Jean-Paul Bouhot et Raymond Étaix, auxquels revient le mérite d'avoir identifié les extraits des *Moralia in Iob*.

<sup>12</sup> sic in codice. Lire: *Epistula 265 ad Seleucianam* (PL 33.1087, lin. 3-14).

<sup>13</sup> sic in codice. Lire: *Epistula 265 ad Seleucianam* (PL 33.1088, lin. 4-11).

<sup>14</sup> sic in codice. Lire: *Aduersus Iouinianum* 1.12 (PL 33.237B10-13 et 238A2-3).

(f. 55) *Tu es qui uenturus es*,<sup>15</sup> *an alium expectamus?* (Mt 11:3; Lc 7:19). IERON<YMV>: «Non ait 'Tu es qui uenisti', sed 'Tu es qui uenturus es'.<sup>16</sup> Et est sensus: Manda mihi, quia ad inferna descensus sum, utrum te et inferis debeam nuntiare, qui nuntiaui superius. Annon conueniat Filio Dei ut gustet mortem, et alium ad haec sacramenta missurus est.»<sup>17</sup> (HIERONYMUS, *Commentarii in Matthaeum* 2.22-27 [CCL 77.77-78])

.....  
(f. 59v) AVG<VSTINVS>, *De ciuitate Dei*: «Quamobrem fieri potest ualdeque credibile est sic nos uisuros esse mundana tunc corpora caeli noui et nouae terrae, ut Deum ubique praesentem et uniuersa etiam corporalia gubernantem per corpora quae gestabimus, et quae conspiciemus, quaquauersum oculos duxerimus, clarissima perspicuitate uideamus, non sicut nunc inuisibilia Dei quae facta sunt intellecta conspiciuntur (Rom 1:20), per speculum in enigmate, ex parte (1 Cor 13:12), ubi plus in nobis ualet fides qua credimus quam<sup>18</sup> rerum corporalium species quam per oculos cernimus corporales.» (AVGVSTINVS, *De ciuitate Dei* 22.29:182-191 [CCL 48.861])

Les textes cités sont extraits, tantôt d'œuvres authentiques, tantôt de pseudépigraphes. A la première catégorie appartiennent les numéros 1 et 36, intégralement transcrits ci-dessus, ainsi que le numéro 3, tiré de saint Grégoire le Grand, *Homiliae in euangelia* 10.2 (PL 76.1111A15-B1) et le numéro 12, extrait d'Augustin, *Retractationes* 2.55.3: 45-48 (CCL 57.134). En revanche, le numéro 2 est une mosaïque de textes empruntés, pour la plupart, aux sermons d'un pseudo-Augustin: aux ff. 55-55v se trouve une longue citation du *Sermo* 160 (PL 39.2059:12-2061:58), tandis qu'au folio 56 on remarque deux courts extraits du *Sermo* 159 (PL 39.2059:4-16; PL 30.225D1-13) et du *Sermo* 158 (PL 39.2070:28-33). Un autre sermon pseudo-augustinien, le *De sacramentis altaris*, récemment publié par Jean-Paul Bouhot,<sup>19</sup> a fourni le texte du numéro 34:

f. 59, lin. 25: Vtrum sub figura an sub ueritate ... (Bouhot, p. 122.2)

f. 59v, lin. 18: ... In hoc ergo creatur illud corpus. (Bouhot, p. 128.51)

Le *Sermo de sacramentis altaris* est, en réalité, une mosaïque, composée d'extraits du *De corpore et sanguine Domini* de Pascase Radbert.<sup>20</sup> La forme sous laquelle ce sermon pseudo-augustinien se présente dans le manuscrit de Berkeley s'apparente à la version fournie par le Décret de Gratien, ainsi que par les manuscrits Avignon, Bibliothèque Municipale 291 et Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 15146. Ce dernier manuscrit provient de l'abbaye de Saint-Victor. Notons que le *Sermo de*

<sup>15</sup> uel est s.s. *add. cod.*

<sup>16</sup> uel est s.s. *add. cod.*

<sup>17</sup> uel es s.s. *add. cod.*

<sup>18</sup> qua *cod.*

<sup>19</sup> J.-P. Bouhot, «Extraits du *De corpore et sanguine Domini* de Pascase Radbert sous le nom d'Augustin» dans *Recherches augustinienes* 12 (1977) 119-73.

<sup>20</sup> Pascase Radbert, *De corpore et sanguine Domini* 4.1-20, 30-31, 37-39, 44; 9.4-6, 9-10, 14-15; 12.4-22, 56-62; 13.11-15, 25-30; 15.14-22, 28-42 (CCM 16.27-28, 53, 76-77, 79, 84-85, 92-94).

*sacramentis altaris* n'a pas de rapport direct avec le thème traité dans la première partie. Il en va de même de plusieurs des pièces qui composent le dossier patristique de la seconde partie.

On ne peut quitter cette section du manuscrit de Berkeley sans mentionner trois distiques élégiaques, copiés par une main du <sup>xiv</sup><sup>e</sup> ou du <sup>xv</sup><sup>e</sup> siècle dans la marge inférieure du folio 54. Ils s'adressent à Marie-Madeleine, celle qui mérita de voir, avant tous les autres, le Christ ressuscité, et qui porta cette joyeuse nouvelle aux Apôtres:

Ore, manu, lacrimis, unguento, mente, capillis  
 dans holocausta Deo, uictima tota manes;  
 unde resurgentem meruisti prima uidere  
 Christum, discipulis gaudia certa ferens.  
 Qui te pro meritis hodie super astra leuauit,  
 hic semper tecum uiuere praestet. Amen.

## V

### ff. 60-66: ANONYME, *Commentaire des Héroïdes d'Ovide*

Les folios 60-66 contiennent un commentaire des *Héroïdes* d'Ovide, précédé d'un *Accessus* dans lequel, après quelques renseignements rudimentaires sur la vie du poète, le commentateur développe les six points suivants: *materia*, *intentio* (*auctoris*), *utilitas* (*operis*), *suppositio* (i.e. *cui parti philosophiae supponatur*), *nomen auctoris*, *occasio*. Le texte, écrit sur deux colonnes par une main du <sup>xiii</sup><sup>e</sup> siècle, assez maladroite, fourmille d'incongruités: je me suis efforcé de corriger celles qui pouvaient l'être. Par ailleurs, j'ai restitué les diphtongues, conformément aux règles édictées par les grammairiens du <sup>xiii</sup><sup>e</sup> siècle.<sup>21</sup> Voici l'*Accessus*, ainsi que l'incipit et l'explicit du commentaire.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>21</sup> Parlant des diphtongues *ae* et *oe*, Guillaume de Conches écrit: «Sed, quamuis una (*sous-entendu*: uocalis) pronunciatur sola, tamen debet utraque scribi» (*Glosae super Priscianum*, passage cité dans «Deux rédactions des gloses de Guillaume de Conches sur Priscien» dans *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 27 [1960] 242, et reproduit dans É. Jeauneau, *Lectio philosophorum. Recherches sur l'École de Chartres* [Amsterdam, 1973], p. 365).

<sup>22</sup> Comme on le verra plus loin (n. 26), le début de l'*Accessus* («Publius ... exilium misit») se retrouve, avec quelques variantes, en deux autres manuscrits. Les sigles utilisés pour noter les variantes sont les suivants:

B = Berkeley, University of California, Bancroft Library 2

P = Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 8197

V = Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vat. lat. 3292.

J'ai utilisé les transcriptions qui m'ont été généreusement communiquées par M. François Dolbeau pour V, par M. Hugues-V. Shooner pour P. Le texte d'Ovide auquel je me réfère est celui de l'édition de H. Dörrie: *P. Ovidii Nasonis Epistulae Heroidum* (Berlin-New York, 1971).

(f. 60a) Pub[p]lius Ovidius Naso romanus fuit, qui quodam tempore, romanorum iuuenum rogatu impulsus, librum amatoriae artis composuit, solummodo de licitis amoribus praecepta largiendo. Illi uero modum transgredientes, non solum licitis sed etiam illicitis abutebantur. Quo cognito, matronae romanae et etiam boni uiri apud Neronem imperatorem accusauerunt suae artis uitia obiiciendo, et ipsum cum regina uxore adulterium commisisse addendo. Imperator uero in quodam nefario scelere iam ab Ouidio deprehensus sodomiticus, eum nimium exosum habebat. Ideo, supradicta occasione sumpta, illum in Pontum insulam in exilium misit. Qui in exilio positus, uitam longo moerore ducens, romanarum mulierum beniuolentiam sibi recuperare cupiens, epistularum librum 10 composuit, in quo castas extollendo et incestas uituperando ponit ut, earum recepta beniuolentia, ad pristinum statum reducat.

In hoc opere nominantur VI: m(ateria), i(ntentio), u(tilitas), suppositio, nomen auctoris et occasio. Ma(teria) est amasii romani et romanae sub specie graecorum et graecarum introducti. Inten(tio) principalis est, ut supra tetigi, romanarum mulierum amicitias 15 captare hoc modo, scilicet castas commendando et incestas uituperando. Vti(litas) ut, perfectio libro hoc, mulieres et uiri ab illicitis se sciant custodire, et castarum matronarum sequi uestigia, et incestarum respuere uicia. Nomen auctoris est Publius Ovidius Naso. Pu(blius) praenomen est, Naso agnomen ab habitu nasi, O(uuidius) proprium nomen est. Vel Publius dicitur, quia uicia publice redarguit; Naso, quia sicut naso fetida ab odore 20 discernimus, ita uicia a uirtutibus disgregauit; O(uuidius), quia rem suam ouanter dixit. Suppositio satis est nota quod ethicae supponitur, scilicet loquendo de bonis moribus et de malis in hoc libro.

Vel aliter. Materia eius est in hoc opere iuuenes, puellae romanae. V(tilitas) ipsa delectatio, et ab illicito et turpi amore omnes reuocando. I(ntentio) omnium poetarum est 25 aut delectare aut prodesse. Vnde Horacius in poetria:

Aut prodesse uolunt aut delectare poetae.<sup>23</sup>

\*\*\* hoc scilicet, immortalitatem et famam adquirendam. Vnde Ouidius:

Quid petitur clarius nisi tantum fama poetae?<sup>24</sup>

2 rogatu] roguatu (!) P: om. B impulsus] depulsus P composuit] dicitur prescripsisse P de licitis] solutis P 3 modum] carminis add. P: om. V sed add. iuuenes mox sua praecepta transgredientes] quia add. P licitis] solutis P illicitis] non solutis P 4 abutebantur] amoribus add. V cognito] percepto P matronae] matrones (!) V et etiam boni] necnon honesti V 5 accusauerunt] illi add. V: illi dicuntur acuisse (!) P obiiciendo scripsi: obitiendo B: abiciendo P: obtinentes V et ipsum ... addendo om. V regina] regis P: om. V 6 iam om. P Ouidio] est add. B 7 sodomiticus om. PV eum] ipsum P nimium] ualde P Ideo] Vnde V: Quibus de causis P sumpta] suscepta V: om. P 7-8 occasione ... insulam] ipse Ouidius ab imperatore P 8 illum] eum V: om. P misit] relegauit V: fuit missus P 21 quod coniec (fort. haud recte): quid B, incertum 27 \*\*\* (quaedam uerba huic loco deesse suspicor)

<sup>23</sup> Horace, *De arte poetica* 333.

<sup>24</sup> «Quid petitur sacris nisi tantum fama poetis». Ce vers d'Ovide (*Ars amatoria* 3.403) est méconnaissable dans notre *Accessus*. Pour obtenir un hexamètre, j'ai dû changer *intantum* en *nisi tantum*; pour que cet hexamètre ait un sens, j'ai substitué *clarius* à *darius*.

Quare in hoc quoque libro uirum intendit delectare, scilicet per fabulas et pulchras  
 30 uerborum compositiones, et prodesse dehortando nos a turpi et illicito amore, et hoc per  
 Fedram et filiastrum eius, et Helenam et consimiles. Etycae supponitur, quia moralis est,  
 etc. Vniuersalem intencionem in toto libro habet, singularem tantum et propriam habet in  
 unaquaque epistola, sicut in ista, in qua Penelope intendit reuocare Vlixem; et eam  
 commendare contendit, et per eam omnes castas fidem suis uiris seruantes. Vel aliter. Viris  
 35 ac mulieribus licite uel illicite sese amantibus aut despectu se albantibus, ipsis in materia  
 Ouidii habitis, amores uel despectus intendit describere ut, his perlectis, uiri ac mulieres  
 cognoscant qualiter se amare debeant, uel qualiter amorem euitare debeant.

In hac prima epistola commendatur Penelope, legitimum Vlixis seruans amorem; et hoc  
 non agentes reprehenduntur. (f. 60b) Vlixes unus graecorum dux fuit qui ad destruendam  
 40 Troiam iuerunt<sup>25</sup> propter Menelaum, cuius Paris uxorem, scilicet Helenam, rapuerat, sed  
 a quibus Troia destructa. Dum Vlixes in patriam reuersus esset, quia deos in multis  
 offenderat, vii annis per mare errauit. Penelope uero uxor eius, cum a pluribus peteretur,  
 omnes aspernata, tantum maritum suum expectabat. Quem cum uero ubi esset ignoraret,  
 epistolam hanc ad eum sollicite mittit, in qua intendit reuocare eum ad patriam suam et  
 45 ad amorem eius, quoquomodo posset. Et hoc facit, plures inducendo causas, scilicet quod  
 Troia iam capta sit, et quod omnes iam redissent praeter hunc solum, et quod scilicet non  
 potest se defendere a procis bona sua laniantibus, hoc dicens:

Tres sumus im(belles) numero (1.97);

quapropter uenire ne differas, et nisi festinaueris, omnia adnichilabuntur. Numerum  
 50 apposuit, ut ad pietatem reuertendi magis moueretur, et etiam nil sibi describi subiungit  
 dicens:

Nil mihi rescribas, sed tamen ipse ueni (1.2).

Vel aliter ....

... (f. 66a) *Exiguum* (19.170), dico, *coeamus* (19.167) et *demus oscula* (19.168). Sed  
 55 dices mihi quod illis est exiguum. *Vel p(udor)* (19.171), quandoquidem es descriptor ueri  
 maris.

29 delectare *conieci*: delectari B    31 filiastrum *conieci*: filiastro B    32 propriam *conieci*:  
 propria B    34 commendare *scripsi*: comendare B    35 albantibus *ut uid.* B    37 euitare *scripsi*:  
 ei uitare B    43 aspernata *conieci*: expernata B    Quem] *fort.* Quae *intelligendum*

Cet *Accessus* et ce commentaire ne semblent pas avoir été publiés. Un com-  
 mentaire sur les *Epistulae Ouidii*, ayant le même incipit, est signalé dans le

<sup>25</sup> Lecture incertaine. Il n'est malheureusement pas possible de lire *uenerunt*, qui est la leçon du  
 manuscrit du Vatican, Barb. lat. 26, f. 45 (cf. ci-dessous, n. 27), ni *uenerant*, qui est la leçon d'un  
 des *Accessus Ouidii Epistularum* (1.7) publiés par R. B. C. Huygens, *Accessus ad auctores. Bernard  
 d'Utrecht. Conrad d'Hirsau, Dialogus super auctores. Édition critique entièrement revue et augmentée*  
 (Leyde, 1970), p. 30.



manuscrit suivant: Prague, Knihovna metropolitní kapituly H.8, ff. 31-36v (xiv<sup>e</sup> s.). Malheureusement, le temps m'a manqué pour consulter ce manuscrit. En revanche, les huit premières lignes (*Publius ... misit*) du texte publié ci-dessus ont été collationnées sur deux autres manuscrits: Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 8197, f. 89v, et Vatican, Vat. lat. 3292, f. 52v.<sup>26</sup> Quant au paragraphe qui introduit la première *Lettre* des Héroïdes (*In hac prima ... sollicite mittit*), il correspond aux lignes 5-11 du premier des trois *Accessus Ovidii Epistularum* édités par R. B. C. Huygens, *Accessus ad auctores ... Édition critique entièrement revue et augmentée* (Leyde, 1970), pp. 29-30.<sup>27</sup> La *Lettre* 15 n'est pas commentée: le lecteur médiéval n'y avait pas accès.<sup>28</sup> Par ailleurs, le commentaire s'interrompt sur le vers 171 de la *Lettre* 19.

En dépit des lacunes de son texte et des négligences de sa transcription, le commentaire des *Epistulae Heroidum* du manuscrit de Berkeley est un témoin, parmi d'autres, de la fortune d'Ovide au Moyen Âge.<sup>29</sup> On sait d'ailleurs que plusieurs des thèmes abordés dans les *Accessus* médiévaux d'Ovide survivront jusqu'à la Renaissance.<sup>30</sup>

<sup>26</sup> Le manuscrit de Prague (Kapitula H.8) est décrit sous le numéro 1062 dans le catalogue d'A. Podlaha (Prague, 1922). Le manuscrit de Paris (Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 8197) contient aux folios 43-89v (xiii<sup>e</sup> s.) les *Epistulae ex Ponto* d'Ovide. Celui du Vatican (Vat. lat. 3292) contient les *Satires* de Perse (ff. 1-9v) et les *Epistulae ex Ponto* d'Ovide (ff. 10-52v). L'ensemble de ce dernier manuscrit se compose de ii + 53 folios, de 185 × 110 mm.; il a été écrit au xiii<sup>e</sup> siècle; l'*Accessus* du folio 52v est une addition du xiv<sup>e</sup> siècle. Les renseignements concernant les manuscrits de Paris et de Prague m'ont été communiqués par M. Hugues-V. Shooner; ceux concernant le manuscrit de Vatican me viennent de M. François Dolbeau. Je prie ces deux érudits de trouver ici l'expression de ma gratitude.

<sup>27</sup> Notons aussi l'incipit suivant: «Vlixes unus grecorum ducum fuit qui ad destruendam Troiam uenerunt» (Vatican, Barb. lat. 26, f. 45). Cf. *Les manuscrits classiques latins de la Bibliothèque Vaticane*, catalogue établi par É. Pellegrin, J. Fohlen, C. Jeudy, Y.-F. Riou, avec la collaboration d'A. Marucchi, t. 1 (Paris, 1975), p. 75. Le temps m'a manqué pour examiner les gloses qui accompagnent le texte des *Héroïdes* dans le manuscrit Barb. lat. 26, ff. 45-105v. Je ne puis donc préciser la nature du rapport — si rapport il y a — qui existe entre ces gloses et le commentaire du manuscrit de Berkeley.

<sup>28</sup> «For the medieval reader the collection looked somewhat different. The *Liber epistularum* consisted of twenty letters: *Epistulae heroidum* 15, the *Epistula Sapphus*, was missing entirely, *Epistulae heroidum* 16 lacked vv. 39-144 and 21 ended at v. 14» (R. J. Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling. Studies in Medieval School Commentaries on Ovid's 'Ars Amatoria', 'Epistulae ex Ponto', and 'Epistulae Heroidum'* (Munich, 1986), p. 141).

<sup>29</sup> G. Przychocki, «Accessus Ovidiani» dans *Rozprawy Akademii Umiejętności Wydział, Filologiczny* (Séria 3, t. 4; Cracovie, 1911), pp. 65-126; E. A. Quain, «The Medieval Accessus ad auctores» dans *Traditio* 3 (1945) 215-64; R. B. C. Huygens, *Accessus ad auctores*; S. Viarre, *La survie d'Ovide dans la littérature scientifique des xiii<sup>e</sup> et xiv<sup>e</sup> siècles* (Poitiers, 1966); H.-V. Shooner, «Les Bursarii Ovidianorum de Guillaume d'Orléans» dans *Mediaeval Studies* 43 (1981) 405-24; F. T. Coulson, «Hitherto Unedited Medieval and Renaissance Lives of Ovid (I)» dans *Mediaeval Studies* 49 (1987) 152-207.

<sup>30</sup> A. Moss, *Ovid in Renaissance France. A Survey of the Latin Editions of Ovid and Commentaries Printed in France before 1600* (Londres, 1982), pp. 8-18 (*Epistulae Heroidum*).

## VI

ff. 66b-68vb: BERNARD SILVESTRE, *Commentaire sur l'Énéide*

Les folios 66-68b contiennent le *Commentum super sex libros Aeneidos* attribué à Bernard Silvestre. Le texte, sur deux colonnes, semble avoir été écrit par la même main qui a copié le commentaire sur les *Héroïdes* d'Ovide (ff. 60-66) et qui, comme on l'a dit, est du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle. Il est malheureusement incomplet, puisqu'il lui manque la fin du commentaire du livre 5 et le commentaire entier du livre 6 de l'Énéide. Dans l'analyse qui suit, je me réfère à l'édition de Julian Ward Jones et Elizabeth Frances Jones.<sup>31</sup>

## &lt;PROLOGVS&gt;

(f. 66b) Gem[m]inae doctrinae obseruationem perpendimus Maronem in sua Eneide habuisse. Teste namque Macrobio et ueritatem philosophiae docuit et figmentum poeticum non praetermisit. Si quis ergo Eneida ... (éd. Jones, p. 1)

... Ordo est deinceps ut singulorum duodecim uoluminum integumenta secundum ordinem aperiamus. (éd. Jones, p. 3.22)

## &lt;LIBER I&gt;

In primo ergo uolumine Iuno uenit ad Eolum ... (éd. Jones, p. 4.2)

(f. 66va) ... Haec omnia quae in prima aetate contingunt in primo uolumine narrantur. (éd. Jones, p. 4.7)

## EXPOSICIO

Saturni et Op[er]is legimus III<sup>or</sup> fuisse filios qui morsus patris euaserunt, cum alios omnes deuorasset ... (éd. Jones, p. 4.9)

(f. 67va) ... Hactenus in primo uolumine prima aetas, id est infanciam, describitur. (éd. Jones, p. 14.15)

## &lt;LIBER II&gt;

*Conticuere omnes*, etc. In secundo uolumine secundae aetatis, id est puericiae, natura describitur ... (éd. Jones, p. 14.17)

... Narrat enim Frigius Dares perdidisse ciuitatem. (éd. Jones, p. 15.7)

<sup>31</sup> *Commentum quod dicitur Bernardi Silvestris super sex libros Aeneidos Virgilii nunc denuo ediderunt Julianus Jones et Elizabetha Jones. The Commentary on the First Six Books of the Aeneid of Vergil Commonly Attributed to Bernardus Silvestris. A New Critical Edition by Julian Ward Jones and Elizabeth Frances Jones (Lincoln, Neb.-London, 1977).*

## &lt;LIBER III&gt;

*Postquam res Asiae, etc.* In hoc uolumine natura adolescentiae exprimitur. Vt integumentum huius uoluminis deinceps exponamus ... (éd. Jones, p. 15.9)

.....  
(f. 68va) ... In iracundia pater sepel[li]tur, id est obliuioni deus traditur. Iracundi pene apostatantur.<sup>32</sup> Sepultura, quod<sup>33</sup> obliuio est. (éd. Jones, p. 23.16)

## &lt;LIBER IV&gt;

*At regina graui, etc.* In hoc IIII<sup>o</sup> uolumine natura iuuentutis mystice exprimitur. Sed primum summam ... (éd. Jones, p. 23.18)

.....  
(f. 68vb) ... solas cogitationes transit. (éd. Jones, p. 25.21)

## &lt;LIBER V&gt;

*Interea, etc.* In hoc quinto incipit de natura uirilis aetatis. Narratur quod certamina instaurat ... (éd. Jones, p. 25.23)

.....  
... Itaque sensum multiformem et rationi contrapositum intelligimus per Irim multicolore. (éd. Jones, p. 27.9)

Avec ces mots (*per Irim multicolorem*) se termine le commentaire sur l'Énéide dans le manuscrit de Berkeley. Sur les 114 pages qu'occupe ce texte dans l'édition de Jones, seules les 27 premières sont représentées dans notre manuscrit, soit un peu moins du quart. En dépit de cette importante lacune, le manuscrit de Berkeley ne me semble pas devoir être méprisé. On sait, en effet, que la connaissance du commentaire virgilien attribué à Bernard Silvestre a pu progresser grâce aux découvertes successives de nouveaux manuscrits.

C'est Victor Cousin qui, en 1836, signala ce texte à l'attention des érudits.<sup>34</sup> Il fallut attendre quatre-vingt-huit années pour que paraisse, en 1924, l'édition de Wilhelm Riedel, établie sur un seul manuscrit, du xv<sup>e</sup> siècle, celui-là même qu'avait utilisé Victor Cousin, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 16246.<sup>35</sup> Six ans plus tard, en 1930, Stanislas Skimina faisait connaître un troisième manuscrit: Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska 1198, également du xv<sup>e</sup> siècle.<sup>36</sup> Enfin, en 1954, Maria De Marco révélait l'existence d'un manuscrit du xiii<sup>e</sup> siècle, donc notablement plus

<sup>32</sup> apostatantur *cod.*

<sup>33</sup> quod] *fort. quae legendum*

<sup>34</sup> V. Cousin, *Ouvrages inédits d'Abélard pour servir à l'histoire de la philosophie scholastique en France* (Paris, 1836), pp. 639-44.

<sup>35</sup> *Commentum Bernardi Silvestris super sex libros Eneidos Virgilii*, éd. W. Riedel (Greifswald, 1924).

<sup>36</sup> S. Skimina, *De Bernardo Silvestri Vergilii interprete* (seorsum impressum ex Commentationibus Vergilianis) (Cracovie, 1930).

ancien que les deux précédents: Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 3804A.<sup>37</sup> Ces trois manuscrits ont été utilisés par Julian Ward Jones et Elizabeth Frances Jones, auteurs d'une édition critique publiée en 1977.<sup>38</sup> Cette nouvelle édition remplace avantageusement celle de Riedel, pratiquement introuvable.

Parallèlement à ce travail de recherche des manuscrits et d'édition critique du texte, la question de l'authenticité du commentaire sur l'Énéide retenait de plus en plus l'attention des historiens. Le premier à l'avoir posée en toute clarté, me semble-t-il, est André Vernet.<sup>39</sup> Les doutes émis par cet éminent érudit ont amené un certain nombre de chercheurs, non seulement à douter de l'authenticité de l'œuvre, mais à conclure plus ou moins ouvertement à son inauthenticité. Ayant été, bien malgré moi, mêlé à cette controverse, je me permets de saisir l'occasion qui m'est offerte de préciser ma pensée. Dans un article intitulé «Note sur l'école de Chartres», publié en 1964, je citais quelques extraits d'un commentaire alors inédit — il a été édité depuis, de main de maître, par Haijo Westra<sup>40</sup> — sur Martianus Capella. Je faisais remarquer alors que ce dernier commentaire présentait des ressemblances frappantes avec le *Commentum super sex libros Eneidos* attribué à Bernard Silvestre. En conséquence, je suggérais d'attribuer au même auteur le commentaire sur Martianus Capella, «si toutefois, précisais-je, Bernard Silvestre est bien l'auteur du commentaire sur l'Énéide qu'on lui attribue». Et j'ajoutais: «L'authenticité de ce dernier écrit, jamais contestée, n'a cependant jamais été sérieusement examinée. Il ne m'appartient pas de le faire.»<sup>41</sup> Je croyais avoir été clair. Cependant, voilà ce qu'on m'a fait dire: «Jeauneau, accepting the ascription of the Vergil commentary to Bernard, *ipso facto* attributed the Capella commentary to Bernard as well»,<sup>42</sup> et encore: «Jeauneau, however, *accepting without question* the attribution of the *Aeneid* commentary to Bernard Silvestris,

<sup>37</sup> M. De Marco, «Un nuovo codice del commento di Bernardo Silvestre all'Eneide» dans *Aevum* 28 (1954) 178-83.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. ci-dessus, n. 31.

<sup>39</sup> A. Vernet, «Bernardus Silvestris et sa «Cosmographia»» dans *École Nationale des Chartes. Positions des thèses ... de 1937*, pp. 167-74. La thèse elle-même, toujours inédite, a été rendue accessible aux lecteurs américains grâce à Brian Stock (cf. W. Wetherbee, *Platonism and Poetry in the Twelfth Century. The Literary Influence of the School of Chartres* [Princeton, 1972], p. 159 n. 10). Les raisons alléguées contre l'attribution du *Commentum* à Bernard Silvestre sont évoquées dans B. Stock, *Myth and Science in the Twelfth Century. A Study of Bernard Silvester* (Princeton, 1972), p. 36 n. 42, et reproduites par J. W. Jones-E. F. Jones, éd., *Commentum quod dicitur Bernardi Silvestris*, pp. x-xi.

<sup>40</sup> H. J. Westra, éd., *The Commentary on Martianus Capella's «De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii» Attributed to Bernardus Silvestris* (Toronto, 1986).

<sup>41</sup> «Note sur l'École de Chartres» dans *Studi medievali*, 3<sup>e</sup> série, 5 (1964) 844-45 (reproduit dans *Bulletin de la Société Archéologique d'Eure-et-Loir* [4<sup>e</sup> trimestre 1964], *Mémoires* 23.24-25, et dans É. Jeauneau, *Lectio philosophorum*, pp. 28-29).

<sup>42</sup> J. W. Jones-E. F. Jones, éd., *Commentum quod dicitur Bernardi Silvestris*, p. x.

attributed the Martianus commentary to the same author.»<sup>43</sup> En quelle langue faut-il écrire pour être compris? En écrivant, en 1964, que l'authenticité du *Commentum* n'avait jamais été sérieusement examinée, j'étais, en fait, le premier à soulever publiquement cette question, que j'avais eu maintes fois l'occasion de discuter, au cours d'entretiens privés, avec André Vernet. Il est vrai que je ne m'engageais pas, et laissais la question ouverte, avec l'espoir que d'autres y exerceraient leur talent: j'ai été exaucé au delà de mes espérances. Mais je ne reconnais pas ma pensée dans les deux jugements exprimés en anglais, que j'ai recopiés ci-dessus.<sup>44</sup> En vérité, je ne partirai pas en guerre pour revendiquer la paternité de Bernard Silvestre sur le *Commentum*. Je suis parfaitement indifférent à l'issue du conflit qui oppose les partisans de l'authenticité à ceux de l'inauthenticité. Une seule chose m'irrite. C'est une espèce de syllogisme, que je crois découvrir dans l'argumentation de certains adversaires de l'authenticité du *Commentum*. Voici ce syllogisme, ou plutôt, cet enthymème: Bernard Silvestre n'a pas pu écrire le *Commentum*; donc il ne l'a pas écrit.

Je conteste la mineure de ce syllogisme: «Bernard Silvestre n'a pas pu écrire le *Commentum super sex libros Aeneidos* qu'on lui attribue». Qui peut le dire? Et comment le prouver? On a trouvé dans le *Commentum* des affirmations qui semblent contredire, ou qui contredisent en fait l'enseignement de Guillaume de Conches. Soit. Mais qui nous dit que Bernard Silvestre et Guillaume de Conches — qui avaient incontestablement plus d'un point commun — étaient toujours et en tout du même avis? Par ailleurs, on a cru trouver des contradictions entre le *Commentum* et la *Cosmographia* de Bernard Silvestre. Il faudrait démontrer d'abord qu'il y a vraiment contradiction.<sup>45</sup> Mais même si cela est démontré, pouvons-nous refuser à un homme du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle un droit auquel aucun de nous, pour son compte, ne voudrait renoncer, celui de changer d'opinion?

Plusieurs médiévistes, et non des moindres, déclarent ne voir aucune raison sérieuse pour rejeter l'authenticité du *Commentum*.<sup>46</sup> En effet, Bernard Silvestre

<sup>43</sup> C. Baswell, «The Medieval Allegorization of the *Aeneid*: MS Cambridge, Peterhouse 158» dans *Traditio* 41 (1985) 210.

<sup>44</sup> Je reconnais mieux ma pensée dans les lignes suivantes: «In assigning this commentary tentatively to Bernard, Jeaneau himself indicates that his evidence rests on the assumption that Bernard was also the author of the *Aeneid* commentary» (B. Stock, «A Note on Thebaïd Commentaries: Paris, B.N. lat. 3012» dans *Traditio* 27 [1971] 469 n. 12).

<sup>45</sup> On pourra voir, à ce sujet, les judicieuses remarques de Peter Dronke: *Bernardus Silvestris. Cosmographia*, edited with introduction and notes by P. Dronke (Leyde, 1978), pp. 4-5.

<sup>46</sup> «I have not seen any convincing reason for denying Bernard the authorship of the commentary on the *Aeneid* that is ascribed to him in one, admittedly late, manuscript, as well as in a second manuscript of uncertain date, which today is lost» (P. Dronke, *ibid.*, p. 3). Cf. P. Dronke, *Fabula. Explorations into the Uses of Myth in Medieval Platonism* (Leyde, 1974), p. 180 n. 1. De son côté, Jean Jolivet déclare: «On ne voit pas de différence, sur ce point, entre ce commentaire [*Commentum super sex libros Aeneidos*] et la *Cosmographia*» («Les rochers de Cumes et l'ancre de Cerbère. L'ordre du savoir selon le *Commentaire* de Bernard Silvestre sur l'Énéide» dans *Pascua mediaevalia. Studies voor Prof. Dr. J. M. De Smet*, éd. R. Lievens-E. Van Mingroot-W. Verbeke [Leuven, 1983],

aurait pu écrire ce *Commentum*.<sup>47</sup> N'en concluons pas qu'il l'a écrit: «a posse ad actum non ualet illatio». Ne décrétons pas, non plus, qu'il n'a pas pu l'écrire. L'auteur de la *Cosmographia* était sûrement qualifié pour commenter les six premiers livres de l'Énéide, non seulement parce que «qui peut plus, peut moins», mais aussi, et surtout, parce que les deux œuvres, *Cosmographia* et *Commentum*, s'inscrivent dans le même milieu culturel, sont les produits d'un même terroir. L'auteur du *Commentum* décrypte un message philosophique caché sous les *integumenta* poétiques de Virgile, l'auteur de la *Cosmographia* enveloppe un message philosophique sous un manteau emprunté à la mythologie classique; le premier va de l'*integumentum* à la *philosophia*, le second de la *philosophia* à l'*integumentum*. A priori, rien ne s'oppose à ce que le même individu ait effectué l'aller-et-retour, passant tantôt de l'*integumentum* à la *philosophia*, tantôt de la *philosophia* à l'*integumentum*. Encore une fois, gardons-nous de conclure de la puissance à l'acte. Disons plutôt ceci. Si l'auteur du *Commentum* n'est pas Bernard Silvestre, c'est quelqu'un qui lui ressemblait beaucoup, quelqu'un qui avait lu les mêmes textes et les avait interprétés dans le même esprit. Entendons-nous bien. Je ne prétends pas que tous les arguments invoqués contre l'attribution du *Commentum* à Bernard Silvestre sont de ce type. Il en est dont je suis prêt à reconnaître le bien-fondé. Mais ceux qui se limitent à exploiter le syllogisme énoncé ci-dessus me paraissent sans fondement.

Bernard Silvestre ayant été écarté, il fallut lui trouver un remplaçant. Le premier candidat qui se présenta fut Bernard de Chartres. L'hypothèse, avancée par André Vernet, et accueillie avec sympathie par ceux qui souhaitaient se débarrasser de Bernard Silvestre,<sup>48</sup> est restée longtemps dépourvue de preuve. Récemment, Edmé Smits a cru pouvoir apporter, en faveur de l'attribution du *Commentum* à Bernard de Chartres, sinon une preuve au sens rigoureux du terme, au moins un indice. Dans son *Chronicon*, Hélinand de Froidmont († 1229 env.) cite des extraits du *Policraticus* (livre VIII, ch. 24-25) de Jean de Salisbury.<sup>49</sup> Or, comme on le sait

p. 270 n. 26 [pp. 263-76]). Dans le même sens, se référant à l'étude de Theodore Silverstein (*Modern Philology* 46 [1948] 92-116) sur la *Cosmographia* de Bernard Silvestre, Winthrop Wetherbee écrit: «The qualities which Silverstein has noted as typifying his poetry are present as well in his commentaries» (*Platonism and Poetry*, p. 105).

<sup>47</sup> Les éditeurs du *Commentum* écrivent eux-mêmes: «The claim that Bernardus Silvestris wrote the Vergil commentary which we have edited must, for the reasons just stated, at least be considered suspect. Our investigations have not provided us with evidence to definitively refute or substantiate this claim» (J. W. Jones-E. F. Jones, éd., *Commentum quod dicitur Bernardi Silvestris*, p. xi).

<sup>48</sup> J. W. Jones-E. F. Jones, éd., *ibid.*

<sup>49</sup> E. R. Smits, «New Evidence for the Authorship of the Commentary on the First Six Books of Virgil's *Aeneid* Commonly Attributed to Bernardus Silvestris?», dans *Non nova, sed nove. Mélanges de civilisation médiévale dédiés à Willem Noomen* (Groningen, 1984), pp. 239-46. Cf. Jean de Salisbury, *Policraticus* 8.24-25 (éd. C. C. J. Webb, t. 2, pp. 415-21; PL 199.816D-820B). Le texte d'Hélinand (*Chronicon* 8.71) est cité par Edmé R. Smits d'après le manuscrit du Vatican, Reg. lat. 535.

depuis longtemps,<sup>50</sup> Jean de Salisbury, en ces deux chapitres, utilise largement le *Commentum super sex libros Aeneidos* attribué à Bernard Silvestre. Tout naturellement, Hélinand de Froidmont cite ces extraits du *Policraticus* sous le nom de l'évêque de Chartres (*Carnotensis*). Toutefois, si l'on en croit Edmé Smits, ce ne serait pas l'évêque de Chartres qu'Hélinand désignerait ainsi, mais Bernard de Chartres. Par voie de conséquence, on serait en droit de conclure, hypothétiquement, qu'Hélinand de Froidmont et Jean de Salisbury attribuaient le *Commentum* à Bernard de Chartres. J'ai dit «hypothétiquement», car Edmé Smits a donné au titre de son étude une forme interrogative: «New Evidence for the Authorship of the Commentary on the First Six Books of Virgil's *Aeneid* Commonly Attributed to Bernardus Silvestris?». Cette interrogation semble appeler une réponse. L'amitié que j'ai pour l'auteur et l'estime en laquelle je tiens ses travaux m'autorisent, je pense, à répondre en toute aménité, mais avec franchise: non. On ne peut absolument rien tirer de cette citation d'Hélinand en faveur d'une attribution du *Commentum* à Bernard de Chartres. Edmé Smits suppose que le manuscrit du *Policraticus* utilisé par Hélinand comportait, dans ses marges, à l'endroit où Jean de Salisbury paraphrase le *Commentum*, la mention *Carnotensis*, laquelle, sous la plume de Jean, signifie *Senex carnotensis*, autrement dit *Bernardus carnotensis*. Or, Hélinand de Froidmont, «qui connaissait bien les théories de l'école de Chartres»,<sup>51</sup> ne pouvait hésiter — nouvelle supposition — sur la signification de cette épithète: pour lui, comme pour Jean de Salisbury, *Carnotensis* signifiait évidemment *Bernardus carnotensis*. Cela fait beaucoup de suppositions! Alors qu'au nom d'une critique exigeante on nous invitait à douter de l'inscription *Commentum Bernardi Silvestris*, voilà qu'on nous suggère d'adopter la conjecture *Bernardus carnotensis*, là où, dans le manuscrit, on lit seulement *Carnotensis*. Il est vrai que Jean de Salisbury, parlant de Bernard de Chartres, l'appelle parfois *Senex carnotensis*; il le fait toujours dans un contexte qui exclut toute ambiguïté. Il en va autrement dans le cas qui nous occupe ici. Prétendre qu'en citant sous une forme abrégée (*Carnotensis*) un auteur fameux, que ses contemporains appelaient *Iohannes carnotensis*, Hélinand de Froidmont voulait faire entendre à ces derniers que ce *Carnotensis* était en fait *Bernardus carnotensis*, sous-diacre et chancelier de l'église de Chartres, mort depuis longtemps et vraisemblablement oublié, c'est prêter aux lecteurs du *Chronicon* un don de clairvoyance supérieur à la moyenne, à moins de supposer qu'Hélinand lui-même ne se souciait guère d'être compris de ses lecteurs. Que le cistercien de Froidmont ait bien connu les théories de l'école de Chartres, comme dit Edmé Smits, n'est certes pas impossible. Il n'empêche qu'il attribuait le *De sex dierum operibus* de Thierry de Chartres à Hugues de

<sup>50</sup> G. Padoan, «Tradizione e fortuna del commento all'*Eneide* di Bernardo Silvestre» dans *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 3 (1960) 234-35 [227-40].

<sup>51</sup> E. R. Smits, «New Evidence», 243.

Saint-Victor!<sup>52</sup> Au demeurant, pourquoi faudrait-il que l'auteur du *Commentum* s'appelât Bernard? Si la mention du manuscrit de Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 16246 (*Commentum Bernardi Silvestris*) est suspecte, comme on l'a dit et répété, pourquoi limiter nos soupçons au *cognomen* (*Silvestris*)? Pourquoi supposer que le copiste (ou le bibliothécaire) qui nous a trompés sur le *cognomen*, nous a dit la vérité concernant le *nomen* (*Bernardus*)?<sup>53</sup> S'il faut être critiques, soyons-le jusqu'au bout, et concluons, comme le font sagement les auteurs d'une traduction anglaise du *Commentum*: «For whether or not the author of the *Commentary on the First Six Books of the Aeneid* is the Bernardus who taught so successfully at Tours in the twelfth century, some other Bernardus, or only an alleged Bernardus, the commentary itself remains a crucial document of medieval literary history.»<sup>54</sup>

On ne saurait mieux dire. En effet, les qualités intrinsèques du *Commentum*, ainsi que son importance dans l'histoire de l'exégèse virgilienne, sont de mieux en mieux perçues par les historiens de la littérature et de la pensée occidentales. Alors que Comparetti mentionnait le *Commentum* en passant, et non sans quelque sentiment de pitié pour cette pâle fleur éclore «sous le froid soleil de la scolastique»,<sup>55</sup> Pierre Courcelle le cite à plusieurs reprises dans sa volumineuse étude sur la lecture de Virgile.<sup>56</sup> En vérité, il serait surprenant qu'un écrit dont Jean de Salisbury, ainsi qu'on l'a dit, a su tirer profit, et que Coluccio Salutati cite avec estime sous le nom d'*Allegorizator Virgili*,<sup>57</sup> fût médiocre. Parmi les travaux les plus

<sup>52</sup> N. M. Häring, *Commentaries on Boethius by Thierry of Chartres and His School* (Toronto, 1971), p. 46. J'ai recensé ces citations (*Hugo de sex diebus*) dans ma «Note sur l'école de Chartres», 838 (*Lectio philosophorum*, p. 22).

<sup>53</sup> Il faut reconnaître que la confusion créée dans l'histoire littéraire autour des différents personnages qui, au xii<sup>e</sup> siècle, ont porté le nom de Bernard justifie la méfiance dont l'inscription *Commentum Bernardi Silvestris* a été l'objet. Faut-il étendre cette méfiance au manuscrit perdu d'Amplonius, qui contenait un *Commentum Bernhardi Silvestris super 6 libris Eneidos*? Peut-être bien, puisque la description du même manuscrit mentionne un *Commentum Bernhardi Silvestris super Theodolum* (G. Padoan, «Tradizione e fortuna», 234 n. 1). Or, le commentaire sur Theodolus qui nous a été conservé est communément attribué à Bernard d'Utrecht.

<sup>54</sup> *Commentary on the First Six Books of Virgil's Aeneid by Bernardus Silvestris*, translated with introduction and notes by E. G. Schreiber and T. E. Maresca (Lincoln, Neb.-London, 1979), p. ix. Une autre traduction anglaise, inédite celle-là, se trouve dans W. D. Faulhaber, *Leaves from the Golden Bough: An Historico-Critical Study of Selected Medieval Mythographers and a New Translation of Bernard Silvester's Twelfth-Century Commentary on the Aeneid* (Diss. Southern Illinois, 1975), pp. 120-289. Pour d'autres candidats à la paternité du *Commentum*, ayant porté le nom de Bernard, cf. C. Baswell, «The Medieval Allegorization», 214-15.

<sup>55</sup> D. Comparetti, *Virgilio nel Medio Evo*, nuova edizione a cura di G. Pasquali (Florence, 1937), pp. 143-44. Cf. A. Vernet, «Virgile au Moyen Age» dans *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. Comptes rendus des séances de l'année 1982* (Paris, 1982), pp. 761-72.

<sup>56</sup> P. Courcelle, *Lecteurs païens et lecteurs chrétiens de l'Enéide*, t. 1: *Les témoignages littéraires* (Paris, 1984), pp. 35, 36, 146, 420, 503.

<sup>57</sup> *Colucii Salutati De laboribus Herculis*, éd. B. L. Ullman (Zurich, 1951), pp. 193.3-16, 194.2-5, 573.6, 582.4. Cf. *Commentum quod dicitur Bernardi Silvestris*, éd. J. W. Jones-E. F. Jones, pp. 71.19-27, 16-18 et 65.1.



remarquables consacrés au *Commentum* au cours des dernières années, il faut citer ceux de J. Reginald O'Donnell,<sup>58</sup> Simone Viarre,<sup>59</sup> et Jean Jolivet.<sup>60</sup>

En ajoutant un nouveau manuscrit à ceux que Victor Cousin, Stanislas Skimina et Maria De Marco avaient découverts, je suis conscient d'apporter une bien modeste contribution à la connaissance du *Commentum super sex libros Aeneidos Virgilii*. J'en suis d'autant plus conscient que ce nouveau témoin de la fortune du *Commentum* est, comme je l'ai déjà dit, gravement incomplet. Cependant, cette découverte quasi insignifiante, faite par hasard au cours d'un voyage en Californie, donne à penser que l'exploration de la tradition manuscrite, préalable à toute édition vraiment critique, n'est peut-être pas encore terminée.

## VII

### ff. 69-73: GUILLAUME DE CONCHES, *Philosophia*

Les derniers folios du manuscrit contiennent la version courante de la *Philosophia* de Guillaume de Conches.<sup>61</sup> Le texte, écrit sur deux colonnes par une main du xiii<sup>e</sup> siècle, est doublement incomplet: au début, il lui manque tout le livre I et plus de la moitié du livre II, à la fin il lui manque un quart du livre IV. La table des chapitres et l'incipit du livre III se trouvent au folio 69b, la table et l'incipit du livre IV aux folios 70vb-71a. La lacune du début s'explique vraisemblablement par la perte d'un ou de plusieurs cahiers, la lacune finale est due à l'arrêt de la transcription. En effet, celle-ci ne semble pas continuer au verso du folio 73, à moins que, sur cette page, qui est la dernière du recueil, et qui de ce fait a été exposée à la lumière et à la poussière, le texte ne soit devenu illisible. A une époque plus récente (xiv<sup>e</sup>/xv<sup>e</sup> s.) quelques courtes notices ont été transcrites sur le verso du folio 73: il m'a été impossible de les déchiffrer sur microfilm.

Voici le début et la fin du fragment de la *Philosophia* conservé dans le manuscrit de Berkeley:<sup>62</sup>

<sup>58</sup> J. R. O'Donnell, «The Sources and Meaning of Bernard Silvester's Commentary on the *Aeneid*» dans *Mediaeval Studies* 24 (1962) 233-49.

<sup>59</sup> S. Viarre, «L'interprétation de l'Énéide. A propos d'un commentaire du douzième siècle» dans *Présence de Virgile. Actes du colloque des 9, 11 et 12 décembre 1976 (Paris É.N.S., Tours)* (Paris, 1978), pp. 223-32.

<sup>60</sup> J. Jolivet, «Les rochers de Cumès» (cf. ci-dessus, n. 46). Pour l'exégèse de Cerbère, cf. J. J. Savage, «The Medieval Tradition of Cerberus» dans *Traditio* 7 (1949-51) 405-10.

<sup>61</sup> A. Vernet, «Un remaniement de la *Philosophia* de Guillaume de Conches» dans *Scriptorium* 1 (1946-47) 243-59 (réimprimé et enrichi dans A. Vernet, *Études médiévales* [Paris, 1981], pp. 143-59 et 660-66).

<sup>62</sup> Je signale par des points souscrits les lettres dont la lecture est douteuse; je remplace par des astérisques les mots que je n'ai pas pu déchiffrer.

f. 69a: *de eclipsi solis \*\*\* aliquantō tempore contingat solem in medio esse zodiaco, qui locus enclipticus dicitur, luna uero ...*

(*Philosophia* II, XIV (XXX), 66 [éd. Maurach, p. 64; PL 172.71c10])

f. 73b: *... ad logisticam cellulam reuertens auditum operatur. Similiter alii sensus fiunt eodem animali spiritu ad aliorum instrumenta per neruos*<sup>63</sup> *a cerebro descendentes.*

(*Philosophia* IV, XXIV (XXVIII), 44 [éd. Maurach, p. 110; PL 172.97b3])

La même œuvre — la *Philosophia* de Guillaume de Conches — là dans sa rédaction longue, ici sous sa forme courante, ouvre et ferme le manuscrit de Berkeley. Or, la rédaction longue présente de nombreuses affinités avec l'enseignement des Victorins. Par ailleurs, le *Didascalicon* de Hugues de Saint-Victor figure aussi dans le recueil. Voilà donc une collection de textes issus en partie de l'école de Saint-Victor<sup>64</sup> et de l'école de Chartres. On sait qu'entre les deux écoles existaient des affinités, nuancées de divergences, que Winthrop Wetherbee a finement étudiées.<sup>65</sup> Qu'ils aient été réunis par hasard ou à dessein — seule une minutieuse analyse paléographique et codicologique pourrait en décider — les opuscules contenus dans le manuscrit 2 de Bancroft Library illustrent assez bien les intérêts culturels communs aux Victorins et aux Chartrains en la première moitié du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle.

<sup>63</sup> *neruos*] *numeros cod.*

<sup>64</sup> On a vu plus haut (n. 26) que l'*Accessus* aux *Epistulae* d'Ovide du manuscrit de Berkeley se retrouve dans le manuscrit Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 8197, f. 89v. Or, comme l'a établi H.-V. Shoener, cette partie du manuscrit parisien provient de l'abbaye de Saint-Victor. On sait, par ailleurs, que la bibliothèque de cette abbaye possédait plusieurs exemplaires des *Pontiques* d'Ovide: *Le catalogue de la bibliothèque de l'abbaye de Saint-Victor de Paris de Claude de Grandrue 1514*, éd. G. Ouy (Paris, 1983), pp. 113 (T. 20), 409 (n° 16), 410 (n° 20). De plus, le texte du *De sacramentis altaris* du pseudo-Augustin (n° 34 du dossier patristique) se rattache à la version offerte par le manuscrit Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 15146, qui provient de l'abbaye de Saint-Victor (*Le catalogue*, pp. 375-76 [KKK 26]). Dans le même manuscrit (f. 163), le catalogue de Claude de Grandrue signale: «Item pars cuiusdam libri poetici cuius initium: *Hanc tua Penelope*» (Ovide, *Epistulae Heroidum* 1.1).

<sup>65</sup> W. Wetherbee, *Platonism and Poetry*, pp. 49-66.

THEORY AND PRACTICE:  
MARRIAGE OF THE UNFREE AND THE POOR  
IN MEDIEVAL SOCIETY\*

*Michael M. Sheehan, C.S.B.*

ABOUT the year 1000, a Swabian serf named Heimrad asked freedom of the lady he had served as priest.<sup>1</sup> The request was granted and he began a life of wandering that eventually led him to Rome and Jerusalem, thence back to Germany. Heimrad lived in extreme poverty, trusting in God for his daily needs. His prayer, his preaching and his eccentric appearance and manners excited admiration in some, revulsion and fear in others. This way of life was, in fact, a foretaste of one that was to become rather common by the end of the eleventh century but, for the moment, as his biographer tells us, the limitations of believers who met him were such that he hid his light under a bushel.<sup>2</sup>

On his return to Germany, Heimrad so impressed Arnold, abbot of Hersfeld, whom he met at the monastery of Memleben, that he was invited to become a monk. Ever the individualist, Heimrad refused to take vows or wear the habit, though he did live with the community. One day he announced in chapter that he wished to withdraw. Asked for his reasons, he replied that he did not think that he could save his soul if he continued to live in the monastery. The abbot was furious; he kicked Heimrad and had him ejected. As he waited at the door of the guesthouse, Heimrad remarked that neither the monks nor the abbot had treated him with sufficient respect, given his birth. He asserted that his was a noble line and that he was brother of the emperor.<sup>3</sup> The monk who overheard the remark was

\* In this study, I am much indebted to the insights of my late colleague, Reverend Arthur P. Gibson; his assistance proved crucial in the reflections that follow. The essay was read in an earlier form at the Assumption University Symposium, Windsor, 26-27 October 1979.

<sup>1</sup> '... cum esset in obsequio cuiusdam matronae ... ipse libertati se donari petiit' (*Vita sancti Haimeradi presbiteri auctore Ekkeberto*, ed. R. Köpke [MGH SS 10; Hanover, 1852; rpt. Leipzig, 1925], pp. 599-601). The *Vita* is cited by Rosalind B. Brooke in *The Coming of the Friars* (Historical Problems: Studies and Documents 24; London, 1975), pp. 40-44.

<sup>2</sup> '... sed propter credentium penuriam lucerna diu latebat sub modio' (*Vita*, p. 599; cf. Mt 5:15).

<sup>3</sup> '... fertur interea in hanc vocem prorupisse, non recte se nec satis honorifice pro natalibus suis tractatum fuisse a monachis atque ab abbate, latuisse illos generis sui nobilitatem, imperatoris fratrem se esse' (*ibid.*, p. 600).

not impressed, but he brought Heimrad back to the abbot who had him flogged until he finally explained his meaning: had not St. Paul taught 'sive servus sive liber, omnes in Christo unum sumus',<sup>4</sup> and did Christ himself not seek to make us understand that we have one Father in heaven, calling all men brothers (Mt 23:9)? The abbot was no more impressed than the monk had been; Heimrad was brutally beaten and thrown out of the monastery.

Heimrad's sorrows were far from ended, though eventually he was able to find a bishop who understood him and would provide protection and peace. The happy ending, however, is not the part of the story that is important for the purpose of this article. It is, rather, Heimrad's self-evaluation as contrasted with others' judgment of him. Here one meets the problem of understanding how, at any given time in the history of mankind, members of the lowest classes were valued by themselves and by their 'superiors' and whether, in those cases where the said superiors maintained that certain rights and responsibilities pertained to all, they actually intended that the lowest classes should exercise them.<sup>5</sup> How was a peasant like Heimrad judged by his lord? how was he judged by his peers? how did he see himself within the social order? For the understanding of the medieval period of European history, a period during which the majority of society were members of the unfree peasantry or poor dwellers in the towns, much might be gained if criteria of judgment could be established that would assist in answering those questions.

The century during which Heimrad lived saw the beginning of rapid progress in the elaboration of the Christian ideal of marriage and its acceptance by a significant portion of society. In those years, too, it was recognized that marital questions should be judged by the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, a decision of major importance in the order of practice.<sup>6</sup> The ideal in question differed in several ways

<sup>4</sup> Gal 3:28: 'Non est Judaeus, neque Graecus; non est servus, neque liber; non est masculus, neque femina. Omnes enim vos unum estis in Christo Jesu.'

<sup>5</sup> See the reflections of Marc Bloch, 'How and Why Ancient Slavery Came to an End' in *Slavery and Serfdom in the Middle Ages. Selected Essays by Marc Bloch*, trans. William R. Beer (Berkeley, 1975), pp. 10-12. 'Heightening of consciousness' is the current expression that seeks to describe this awakening to an awareness of the implications of a theoretical position (the experience of Heimrad or, perhaps, of his biographer). The tendency to avoid facing the consequences of one's position seems to be part of the human condition: one might mention Aristotle's discussion of human nature and its dignity in a society of which a large proportion was rightless; the reflections on the rights of man by Thomas Jefferson, a slaveholder; more recently, public manifestations of surprise and horror over the death by freezing of a mother and her children in London during the bitter winter of 1984-85, when Archbishop Runcie pointed out that death in this manner was all too common among the elderly poor.

<sup>6</sup> The claim was advanced as early as the Council of Agde (506), but its general acceptance was delayed until about 1100; see Pierre Daudet, *Études sur l'histoire de la juridiction matrimoniale. Les origines carolingiennes de la compétence exclusive de l'église (France et Germanie)* (Paris, 1933), and *L'établissement de la compétence de l'église en matière de divorce et de consanguinité (France X<sup>e</sup>-XII<sup>e</sup> siècles)* (Paris, 1941).

from the understanding of marriage that had governed the ménages of all classes in the past. And it was very demanding. It is the intention of this article to examine the questions suggested by Heimrad's experience as they apply to the implementation of this ideal among the lower levels of society in western Europe during the period when it was finally given shape.

# I

It is somewhat surprising, given the importance attached to the institution of marriage in sociology and anthropology that, until comparatively recently, little attention had been paid to its history. Sociologists were long content to ignore the possibility that knowledge of the earlier stages of the institution they studied might lead to deeper understanding of contemporary structures.<sup>7</sup> Social historians, though much interested in the history of the family, paid scant attention to marriage except inasmuch as it was part of the system of family recruitment and property management. For many years it was largely the work of historians of law and, to a lesser extent, of theology, that maintained interest in the history of marriage as such. Recently, especially with the period of major social change that began after the Second World War, many disciplines have tended to come together in an ever deepening study of marriage and the family. In that rather exciting process several important matters have become clear. One of them is that the institution of marriage took a direction in the twelfth century, the implications of which are still being unfolded in our own day.

That development had many causes. One of the most important was the formation of a theory and ideal of marriage that was not only new in several aspects but had powerful institutions prepared to teach and, to a certain extent, to enforce it. Many distinct traditions were contributory to the development. They were derived from social and religious usages of different peoples. Christian thinkers slowly developed a broad theory of human sexuality in which marriage found its place. These notions were in relationship — sometimes of symbiosis, sometimes of conflict — with older traditions among the peoples to whom the Christian religion had spread. By the end of the twelfth century the theory was assuming a degree of completeness and consistency that was new, and it was becoming more and more recognized that it should be the ideal of society.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>7</sup> See John Moge, 'Introduction' to *Changes in the Family* in a special number of *International Social Science Journal* 14.3 (1962) 411-24. Having presented the scholarly accomplishments of the years following World War II, he suggested lines of future work; the value of historical studies was virtually ignored. Contrast the essay, seventeen years later, by Michael Anderson, 'The Relevance of Family History' in *The Sociology of the Family. New Directions for Britain*, ed. Chris. Harris (Sociological Review Monograph 28; Keele, 1979), pp. 49-73.

<sup>8</sup> For the stages of this development see Gabriel LeBras, 'La doctrine de mariage chez les théologiens et canonistes depuis l'an mille' in *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* (henceforth, DTC)

In the anthropology that became generally accepted, human sexuality was seen as an imperious urge, one that especially revealed the damage done to the pristine order within mankind's appetites by the sin of Adam and Eve. The Christian ideal was to deny and sublimate the irrational element in that sexual appetite by a life of continence, a life usually within the framework of a religious order or the clerical state, or to channel the exercise of that appetite by the mutual service of husband and wife in marriage. Each of the three elements of this synthesis — the limited exercise of sexuality, the notion of the married state as the exclusive place of its exercise and the view of the celibate state as a viable and honourable alternative to marriage — entered into conflict with tendencies of mankind and, more particularly, with the different social structures in which Christianity expressed itself. Yet, in principle, the ideal was to triumph. Though several aspects of this development have not yet been investigated, it is already clear that theologians, poets, lawyers and moral guides analysed the nature of marriage, set out the conditions that made it possible, decided on the precise way in which the marriage bond was established, contributed to the design of the procedure of marriage preparation and the liturgies of the wedding itself, concluded that the relationship should be exclusive and permanent, and explored the love that should grow between the couple.<sup>9</sup>

Each of these elements is of considerable interest but, for the present purpose, it is sufficient to consider two of them. First the relationship was seen to be permanent and exclusive, one in which each spouse owed a sexual debt to the

9ii (1927) 2123-2317 and, for a detailed examination of the earlier period, Korbini Ritzer, *Le mariage dans les églises chrétiennes du I<sup>er</sup> au XI<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1970); for a discussion in a broader context, see George H. Joyce, *Christian Marriage: An Historical and Doctrinal Study* (Heythrop Series I; London-New York, 1933). Cf. Robert Fossier, *Histoire sociale de l'occident médiéval* (Paris, 1970), pp. 124-27, and Philippe Ariès, 'Le mariage indissoluble', *Communications* 35 (1982) 123-37.

<sup>9</sup> On the last point, much progress has been made during the last few years. See Philippe Ariès, 'L'amour dans le mariage', *Communications* 35 (1982) 116-22; Johan Chydenius, *Love and the Medieval Tradition* (Societas scientiarum fennica, Commentationes humanarum litterarum 58; Helsinki, 1977); Georges Duby, *Que sait-on de l'amour en France au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle?* (The Zaharoff Lecture for 1982-83; Oxford, 1983); Jean-Louis Flandrin, 'Contraception, mariage et relations amoureuses dans l'Occident chrétien', *Annales: économies, sociétés, civilisations* 24 (1969) 1370-90; Fossier, *ibid.*, pp. 131-32, 158-68; Jean Leclercq, 'The Development of a Topic in Medieval Studies in the Eighties: An Interdisciplinary Perspective on Love and Marriage' in *Literary and Historical Perspectives of the Middle Ages. Proceedings of the 1981 SEMA Meeting*, ed. Patricia W. Cummins, Patrick W. Conner and Charles W. Connell (Morgentown, West Va., 1982), pp. 20-37, and *Love in Marriage in Twelfth-Century Europe* (University of Tasmania Occasional Papers 13; Hobart, 1978); *Love and Marriage in the Twelfth Century*, ed. Willy Van Hoecke and Andries Welkenhuysen (Mediaevalia Iovaniensia, Series 1, Studia 8; Louvain, 1981); Fabian Parmisano, 'Love and Marriage in the Middle Ages', *New Blackfriars* 50 (1969) 599-608, 649-60; Sylvette Rouillan-Castex, 'L'amour et la société féodale', *Revue historique* 272 (1984) 295-329; and Hubert Silvestre, 'La prière des époux selon Rupert de Liège', *Studi medievali*, 3rd Ser., 24 (1983) 725-28.

other, a debt not lightly to be denied. Second, the role of consent in establishing the marriage bond: the interest in the part played by the consent of the spouses led to a discussion in which it was finally decided that there was no marriage without their consent and that, when all was said and done, the consent of no other person or group was necessary. There was much encouragement of the traditional view that family and lordship should play their part in the choice of spouses and their endowment but, by 1200, the principle had been stated that, if there were no impediment between a couple and they consented to marry, no one could prevent them from doing so.<sup>10</sup>

This theory of sexuality, marriage and religious life was developed at the time when Europe, led by the reforming religious element within it, was coming to a homogeneity of intellectual life unknown before, so that the notions and ideals sketched above were, potentially at least, applicable anywhere in the Latin Church. Part of the progress made in the research of recent years touching the history of the family and marriage has been in examining the mode of transmission of these ideas, the tempo and depth of their penetration of society, and the resulting practice.<sup>11</sup>

Even from the rather general and abstract presentation of the development that has just been made it will be clear that some of the elements of that synthesis would collide with the accepted usages of different parts of Europe. Furthermore, even if the ideal in question were intended to be universally applicable, the social structures of the areas in which it was applied varied greatly, so that the mode and degree of reception might be expected to be diverse. Recognizing this, Georges Duby examined the local understanding of family, marriage and sexuality operative among the aristocracy of the Mâconnais during the eleventh and twelfth centuries, confronted it with the model developed by religious thinkers, and showed how older usages adapted to the new ideal.<sup>12</sup> In time, it is to be hoped, a similar procedure will be applied in the examination of the same process in other regions and among other social groups.

<sup>10</sup> See John T. Noonan, Jr., 'Power to Choose', *Viator* 4 (1973) 419-34; Charles Donahue, Jr., 'The Policy of Alexander the Third's Consent Theory of Marriage' in *Proceedings of the Fourth International Congress of Medieval Canon Law Toronto, 21-25 August 1972*, ed. Stephan Kuttner (Monumenta iuris canonici, Series C: Subsidia 5; Vatican City, 1976), pp. 251-81, and 'The Canon Law of the Formation of Marriage and Social Practice in the Later Middle Ages', *Journal of Family History* 8 (1983) 144-58.

<sup>11</sup> Michael M. Sheehan, 'Choice of Marriage Partner in the Middle Ages: Development and Mode of Application of a Theory of Marriage', *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History* 1 (1978) 1-33. See Jack Goody, *The Development of the Family and Marriage in Europe* (Cambridge, 1983), pp. 103-56, and David Herlihy, *Medieval Households* (Cambridge, Mass., 1985), pp. 79-88.

<sup>12</sup> Georges Duby, *Medieval Marriage. Two Models from Twelfth-Century France*, trans. Elborg Forster (Baltimore, 1978).

Among these groups are, of course, the peasantry and that large but virtually silent part of the urban population, the poor. Duby's emphasis on the necessity of local study is important here, for it is abundantly clear that custom varied not only between country and country, region and region but also (though less drastically) between manor and manor, town and town. Prior to these local studies, however, there are other, more fundamental problems to be addressed, problems of mentality, problems touching how the peasant and the poor were seen by those more educated classes who formulated the system that spread throughout Europe. Heimrad, an unfree peasant whose priesthood poses a question as to the application of the laws that forbade the ordination of members of the servile class, concluded that the Christian anthropology, based on the words of Christ and the writings of St. Paul, had serious practical consequences that enhanced his personal value. In the century that followed many others were to draw conclusions touching social and political life as well as religious theory along similar lines. On the other hand, the behaviour of the abbot and monks at Hersfeld left little doubt that they disagreed with Heimrad. It might be said that the abbot's overreaction indicates a fear that Heimrad was right in his assertion, but the general impression created by the account is that the claim was considered to be nonsense.<sup>13</sup>

What is involved here is the general question whether the social consequences of a Christian anthropology, its demands and its assurance of rights — the ideal of marriage would be one of them — were considered applicable to all of society. Did the canonists, civil lawyers and theologians who hammered out the ideal of sexuality with its marital and celibate components consider it to be suitable for the members of the lowest classes as well as for the knight or the citizen of a town? Duby assigned 'the source of the two models of marriage to members of the aristocracy on the one hand and members of the clergy on the other. The consequences of this difference have probably been exaggerated, however, since it cannot be too much emphasized that both groups came from the same families.'<sup>14</sup> Members of the lowest classes rarely if ever played a significant role in the development of the new theory of marriage. Furthermore, those who developed that theory were members of the families and religious institutions that considered it their right to control larger or smaller segments of the lives of unfree peasants. Did they think that the high ideals of marriage that they had developed applied to those who ploughed their fields? Here we meet the difficult question of the extent to which the rules of the society were expected to apply to a subculture, a

<sup>13</sup> This point of view is nicely revealed in the revised *Butler's Lives of the Saints*, published by Herbert Thurston and Donald Attwater in 1956. The editors write: 'His biographer insinuates, let us note, that he *only* meant that he, like the rest of mankind, was a brother of Christ' (italics added). The feast of St. Heimrad of Essingham is 28 June; see *Butler's Lives* (London, 1956), 2.661.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Herlihy, *Medieval Households*, p. 86.



subculture often looked upon as a more or less criminal underworld.<sup>15</sup> Furthermore, even if society's leaders were in agreement that such was the case, to what extent did members of the lower orders see marriage so understood as desirable? were efforts made to convince them of this? were legal and institutional controls devised to ensure compliance and, if so, to what degree?

## II

By the late eleventh and twelfth centuries, when the new theory of marriage was assuming its full development, the last vestiges of slavery were disappearing in northern Europe.<sup>16</sup> Christianity had been born in a world familiar with that institution. As the new faith spread north and west to the tribes conquered by Rome, and later, when the barbarians streamed into the weakening empire, it met slavery among them as well. The missionaries who penetrated the Celtic extremities of Europe, the German homeland and the realms of the Slavs encountered a similar institution.<sup>17</sup> In the period before the birth of Christ and again in the third and following centuries, when military operations were endemic on the frontier of the empire and even within its borders, there was a constant supply of slaves as

<sup>15</sup> See Fossier, *Histoire sociale*, pp. 145-47, 242-43, 258-60.

<sup>16</sup> Useful introductory discussions of this process are in Bloch, *Slavery and Serfdom*; cf. Charles-Edmond Perrin, 'Le servage en France et en Allemagne au moyen-âge' in *Relazioni del x Congresso internazionale di scienze storiche. Storia del medioevo* 3 (Biblioteca storica Sansoni 24; Florence, 1955), pp. 213-45, and Moses I. Finley, *Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology* (New York, 1980), pp. 11-66, and 'Between Slavery and Freedom', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 6 (1964-65) 233-49. See János M. Bak, 'Serfs and Serfdom: Words and Things', *Review* 4 (1980) 3-18; Jacques Boussard, 'Serfs et "colliberti" (xi<sup>e</sup>-xii<sup>e</sup> siècles)', *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes* 107 (1947-48) 205-34; Pierre Dockès, *La libération médiévale* (Paris, 1979), pp. 16-22, 98-139; Philippe Dollinger, *L'évolution des classes rurales en Bavière depuis la fin de l'époque carolingienne jusqu'au milieu du xiii<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1949), pp. 208-209, 253-63; Fossier, *Histoire sociale*, pp. 61-67, 161-68; Paul Ourliac, 'Le servage à Toulouse au xii<sup>e</sup> et xiii<sup>e</sup> siècles' in *Économies et sociétés au moyen âge. Mélanges offerts à Édouard Perroy* (Sér. 'Études' 5; Paris, 1973), pp. 249-61; Pierre Petot, 'Évolution numérique de la classe servile en France du ix<sup>e</sup> au xiv<sup>e</sup> siècle' in *Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin*, vol. 2: *Le servage*, 2nd edition (Brussels, 1959), pp. 159-68; Michael M. Postan, *The Famulus. The Estate Labourer in the xiii<sup>th</sup> and xiiii<sup>th</sup> Centuries* (The Economic History Review Supplements 2; London, 1954); Werner Rösener, *Bauern im Mittelalter* (Munich, 1985), pp. 18-31; C. Van de Kieft, 'Les "colliberti" et l'évolution du servage dans la France centrale et occidentale (x<sup>e</sup>-xii<sup>e</sup> siècle)', *Tijdschrift voor Rechtsgeschiedenis* 32 (1964) 363-95; Charles Verlinden, *L'esclavage dans l'Europe médiévale*, 2 vols. (Bruges-Ghent, 1955-77), 1.729-48, 2.1 n. 2, 91-109 et passim; C. R. Whittaker, 'Circe's Pigs: From Slavery to Serfdom in the Later Roman World', *Slavery and Abolition* 8 (1987) 88-122.

<sup>17</sup> Francis Conte, *Les Slaves. Aux origines des civilisations d'Europe centrale et orientale (vi<sup>e</sup>-xiii<sup>e</sup> siècles)* (L'évolution de l'humanité; Paris, 1986), pp. 89-93, 183-84, 265-66, 416, 422-26; Wendy Davies, *Wales in the Early Middle Ages* (Leicester, 1982), pp. 53-64; Carl Koehne, *Die Geschlechtsverbindungen der Unfreien im fränkischen Recht* (Untersuchungen zur deutschen Staats- und Rechtsgeschichte 22; Breslau, 1888), pp. 1-10; Niels Skyum-Nielsen, 'Nordic Slavery in an International Setting', *Mediaeval Scandinavia* 11 (1982) 126-48.

the booty of war. They provided household servants and manned many of the larger enterprises of the time in agriculture, mining and manufacturing. But, in a process lasting many centuries, the economic, political and ideological structures of the region became less suitable for slavery. In different regions and at different tempos the slave supply diminished, the enterprises that had been able to make profitable use of slave gangs were no longer feasible, and a growing embarrassment that fellow-Christians should be one's slaves lessened their attractiveness.<sup>18</sup> At the same time, certain liberties were acquired by custom and even by law so that the 'slave' was no longer the rightless one of the early Empire.<sup>19</sup> Many were established on lands over which they enjoyed a degree of control, a situation that encouraged them to establish a ménage that was their own.<sup>20</sup> At the same time, as the seigniorie established itself in one or other of its forms, many of those among the lower ranks of freemen became more and more dependent on their lords and lost their liberty. By the end of the eleventh century, they and those who in a variety of ways, either recently or in a remote past, had risen above their position as slaves coalesced into a servile peasant group, denoted by an embarrassingly varied set of terms but that can, for present purposes, be called serfs.<sup>21</sup> It is these serfs and many of those from

<sup>18</sup> See *The Cambridge Economic History of Europe*, vol. 1: *The Agrarian Life of the Middle Ages*, 2nd edition, ed. Michael M. Postan (Cambridge, 1966), pp. 246-55, and bibliography pp. 787-88; Bloch, 'How Ancient Slavery Came to an End', 25; Georges Duby, 'Sur les voies ouvertes par Marc Bloch: esclavage et servage au moyen âge', *Annales: économies, sociétés, civilisations* 12 (1957) 123-26; Jacques Heers, *Esclaves et domestiques au moyen âge dans le monde méditerranéen* (Paris, 1981), pp. 95-121.

<sup>19</sup> See the discussion of the meaning of freedom in this context in Marc Bloch, 'Personal Liberty and Servitude in the Middle Ages, Particularly in France. Contribution to a Class Study' in *Slavery and Serfdom*, pp. 66-91, 203-26; Pierre Petot, 'L'hommage servile. Essai sur la nature juridique de l'hommage', *Revue historique de droit français et étranger* (henceforth RHDfE), 4th Ser., 6 (1927) 86-87; Theodore J. Rivers, 'Symbola, manumissio et libertas Langobardorum: An Interpretation of gaida and gisil in Edictus Rothari 224 and Its Relationship to the Concept of Freedom', *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte. Germanistische Abteilung* 95 (1978) 57-78.

<sup>20</sup> See Bloch, 'How Ancient Slavery Came to an End', 4-6, 14; Boussard, 'Serfs et "colliberti"', 234; André Déléage, *La vie rurale en Bourgogne jusqu'au début du onzième siècle*, 2 vols. (Mâcon, 1941), 1.552; Dockès, *La libération médiévale*, pp. 19-20, 140; Herlihy, *Medieval Households*, pp. 56-78; Postan, *The Famulus*, pp. 11-14. The process resulted in the creation of servile ménages, a situation that probably encouraged religious thinkers to reflect on the quality of the relationship. On the other hand, the fact that these unions came to be considered to be marriage tended to consolidate the servile household (see Bloch, *ibid.*, p. 14).

<sup>21</sup> In the case of Anglo-Saxon England, an area in which slavery resulting from captivity continued to be practiced, there is evidence of a significant slave population and slave trade up to and after the Norman conquest. Within two generations, however, the slave had virtually disappeared (Postan, *ibid.*). One indication of the change is the frequent mention of slaves, their rights and obligations in earlier councils and synods. After the condemnation of traffic in slaves at the Council of Westminster (1102) there was to be no further reference to them. See c.39 (*Councils and Synods with Other Documents Relating to the English Church 1: A.D. 871-1204*, ed. Dorothy Whitelock, Michael Brett and Christopher N. L. Brooke, 2 vols. [Oxford, 1981], 2.681).

among them who fled to the 'freedom' of the towns — groups that constituted a much higher proportion of the population than was ever the case with the slaves of the earlier period — that are the special object of this study.

The slave, in the older sense of the term *servus*, continued as a significant element in the population of the regions around the north shore of the Mediterranean.<sup>22</sup> Here, where there was a constant war with non-Christian peoples or when oriental Christians fled before Islamic armies, there was a source of captives and refugees that continued the slave class through the Middle Ages. Eventually the acceptance of the idea of slavery, and slaves themselves, would be carried by Iberian explorers to the worlds they discovered.

Christian thinkers and Christian thinking played a role in the process whereby, through most of Europe, slavery disappeared.<sup>23</sup> To the modern mind it is often a surprise, sometimes a scandal, that an institution which involved such a fundamental denial of human worth was not confronted directly by Christ and by his followers. By and large, their approach was very different.<sup>24</sup> The principle was that invoked by Heimrad: all men are brothers; before God there is really no difference between slave and free. The immediate practical consequence was provided by St. Paul in his *Epistle to Philemon*. Here there was no questioning the fact that Onesimus was a slave, but Philemon was urged to treat him as a brother. On the other hand, Onesimus returned to his master at Paul's bidding and, it can be presumed, was expected to accept his position as slave and serve his master with the generous spirit that both Paul and Peter recommended in their letters.<sup>25</sup> It was not to be a confrontation with the institution, but an amelioration of the conditions of the slave's life which contributed to the fact that, in the end, he could no longer be considered to be a slave at all. One of the areas in which these principles were applied was that of slave marriage.

In Roman law, though under favourable conditions a slave might establish a stable, even a devoted ménage, that relationship was at best a *contubernium*. The slave could not have *conubium*, the legal capacity for marriage in the full sense of

<sup>22</sup> See Verlinden, *L'esclavage* 1.246-629, 745-822 and 2 passim; Heers, *Esclaves et domestiques*, pp. 66-78.

<sup>23</sup> See Bloch, 'How Ancient Slavery Came to an End', 10-25; Verlinden, *ibid.* 1.31, 40.

<sup>24</sup> See J. Kevin Coyle, 'Empire and Eschaton. The Early Church and the Question of Domestic Relationships', *Église et théologie* 12 (1981) 75; John F. Maxwell, *Slavery and the Catholic Church. The History of Catholic Teaching Concerning the Moral Legitimacy of the Institution of Slavery* (Chichester, 1975), pp. 1-43, and the bibliography assembled there, and Raoul Naz, 'Esclave', *Dictionnaire de droit canonique* (henceforth DDC) 5 (1953) 448-54. Some writers did propose the end of slavery. Two late Carolingian examples are Smaragdus of Saint-Mihiel, in his *Via regia* (ca. 825), chap. 30 (PL 102.967-68), and Jonas of Orléans, in *De institutione laicali* 2.22-23 (PL 106.213-18); see Fossier, *Histoire sociale*, pp. 43, 51, 65.

<sup>25</sup> Eph 6:5; Col 3:22; 1 Pet 2:18.

the word (*matrimonium iustum*).<sup>26</sup> From what has been learned of Celtic and Germanic custom, the slave's situation was similar among them as well.<sup>27</sup> Even though a couple lived together and brought children into the world, they had no power over themselves, each other or their children, and the set of relationships that they had established could be destroyed at the wish of those who controlled their lives.

This was not acceptable to some Christian teachers.<sup>28</sup> The problem became apparent in an ill-tempered attack on St. Callistus I, bishop of Rome, about 220, in which St. Hippolytus accused him of recognizing the union of a free woman and a slave as marriage and of accepting a secret union as valid.<sup>29</sup> Just how widely this judgment was accepted within the Christian community of Rome or even further afield is unknown. (The voice of Christianity in the wider society was as yet a weak one.) But the case touched the marriage of the slave and the ease with which, from the point of view of a Church leader, an acceptable union could be brought about. As such, it was heavy with promise for the future.

<sup>26</sup> Percy E. Corbett, *The Roman Law of Marriage* (Oxford, 1930), pp. 24-67; Arnold M. Duff, *Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1928; rpt. Cambridge, 1958), pp. 59-60. On the quality of the relationship in some ménages of slave and slave, free and slave, see Beryl Rawson, 'The Roman Family' in *The Family in Ancient Rome. New Perspectives*, ed. Beryl Rawson (Ithaca, N. Y., 1986), pp. 26, 253-54, and 'Family Life among the Lower Classes at Rome in the First Two Centuries of the Empire', *Classical Philology* 61 (1966) 71-83; Orlando Patterson, *Slavery and Social Death. A Comparative Study* (Cambridge, Mass.-London, 1982), pp. 186-89; Richard P. Saller, 'Slavery and the Roman Family', *Slavery and Abolition* 8 (1987) 65-87; Richard P. Saller and Brent D. Shaw, 'Tombstones and Roman Family Relations in the Principate: Civilians, Soldiers and Slaves', *The Journal of Roman Studies* 74 (1984) 124-56, especially 134-39; Susan Treggiari, 'Contubernales in CIL 6', *Phoenix* 35 (1981) 42-69; P. R. C. Weaver, 'The Status of Children in Mixed Marriages' in *The Family in Ancient Rome*, pp. 145-69. I am much indebted to Professor Saller for his advice on this matter.

<sup>27</sup> See William W. Buckland, *The Roman Law of Slavery* (London, 1908), pp. 75-76; T. M. Charles-Edwards, 'Naw Cynwedd Teithiawg: Nine Forms of Union in Wales, Ireland and India' in *The Welsh Law of Women. Studies Presented to Professor Daniel A. Binchy on His Eightieth Birthday 3 June 1980*, ed. Dafydd Jenkins and Morfydd E. Owen (Cardiff, 1980), pp. 23-39; Elizabeth Eames, 'Mariage et concubinage légal en Norvège à l'époque des Vikings', *Annales de Normandie* 2 (1952) 195-208; Edith Ennen, *Frauen im Mittelalter* (Munich, 1984), pp. 85-86; Carl Koehne, *Die Geschlechtsverbindungen der Unfreien im fränkischen Recht* (Untersuchungen zur deutschen Staats- und Rechtsgeschichte 22; Breslau, 1888), pp. 1-23.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Ex 21:1-6. On the contribution of the Jewish tradition to this attitude, see Joseph Freisen, *Geschichte des canonischen Eherechts bis zum Verfall der Glossenliteratur* (Paderborn, 1893), pp. 60-61 nn. 9 and 11. See Louis M. Epstein, *Marriage Laws in the Bible and the Talmud* (Harvard Semitic Series; Cambridge, Mass., 1942), pp. 34-66; Ze'ev W. Falk, *Introduction to Jewish Law of the Second Commonwealth*, 2 parts (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 11; Leiden, 1972-78), 2.263-69; Verlinden, *L'esclavage* 2.21.

<sup>29</sup> *Hippolytus. Refutatio omnium haeresium*, ed. Miroslav Marcovich (Patristische Texte und Studien 25; Berlin-New York, 1986), pp. 355-56. See the discussion in Johannes Quasten, *Patrology*, vol. 2: *The Ante-Nicene Literature after Irenaeus* (Westminster, Md., 1953), pp. 204-206.

Christian teaching on marriage was to see a remarkable development during the first millennium. One aspect of that teaching is of special importance to the present analysis. It had appeared in St. Paul's earliest discussion of the matter in a context where the celibate life was presented as an ideal. Here he did not consider the childbearing aspect of marriage but, recognizing the imperious quality of the sex urge, presented marriage as the means of assuaging it without sin (1 Cor 7:1-9).<sup>30</sup> The Pauline text leaves little doubt that its author considered this to be the usual human condition.<sup>31</sup> This notion was to play an important role in future discussions, especially after it had been expounded in detail in the careful analysis of the married state by St. Augustine.<sup>32</sup> From this point of view, if a slave were considered a mature Christian, he had a right to marry where it was necessary to avoid sexual sin. The question remains — and this is but a restatement of the question with which this study began — whether Christian thinkers thought the members of the servile class to be of sufficient moral responsibility to make this argument a compelling one? The answer to this question is complex. It involves our understanding of both theoretical and practical reflection and the development of modes of implementation that went on simultaneously over many centuries. For purposes of analysis it seems best to distinguish three parts in the question so that they may be examined separately. It must be remembered, however, that the three processes involved went on simultaneously and that all, in fact, were parts of one multifaceted development. The questions are: first, the moral responsibility of the servile class; second, the possibility both theoretical and practical of a true Christian marriage between persons in whom a third party had rights; third, the consequences of the accepted mode of establishing the marriage bond.

### 1. *The Moral Responsibility of the Servile Class*

A basic principle of ethical theory is that there are degrees of responsibility in the act of any individual; medieval moral thinking was of considerable refinement

<sup>30</sup> See Ariès, 'L'amour dans le mariage', 116-18.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Ariès, *ibid.*, 119, and James A. Brundage, 'Concubinage and Marriage in Medieval Canon Law', *Journal of Medieval History* 1 (1975) 3. This notion that spouses had a right to sexual access is the principle that underlay the requirement that the crusader, who would usually leave his wife at home, was to obtain her permission before doing so. Only in a case of extreme necessity — Innocent III judged such to be the case at the time of the Fourth Crusade — was it concluded that this obligation must yield to the higher one of defending Christendom: see James A. Brundage, 'The Crusader's Wife: A Canonistic Quandary', *Studia gratiana* 12 (1967) 425-41.

<sup>32</sup> *De bono coniugali*, chaps. 1-10 (CSEL 41.187-202); St. Augustine, *Treatises on Marriage and Other Subjects*, trans. Charles T. Wilcox et al. (Fathers of the Church 27; New York, 1955), pp. 9-25. Augustine situated this 'good' in the context of all the goods of marriage. A good summary of earlier patristic writing on the necessity of making marriage possible as a means to channel sexual desire is in Ritzer, *Le mariage*, pp. 97-99.

on this matter.<sup>33</sup> To what extent was the slave considered liable for his actions? An examination of the discussion of the circumstances of a moral act found in the penitential books shows that it was agreed that the slave's responsibility was sometimes diminished. The general notion of limited moral responsibility appears in the *Penitential of Cummean* (ca. 650), one of the earlier examples of the literature,<sup>34</sup> and direct reference to the condition of the slave in this regard appears in the *Penitential of Egbert* (ca. 750). Here the reader is reminded that not all are to be judged in the same way, that distinctions must be made according to the sinner's wealth, whether he is free or slave, his age and his status within the Church.<sup>35</sup> Towards the end of the eighth century a more definite conclusion in this regard is drawn in the *Paenitentiale Valicellanum* I: 'Understand this, brothers: when male or female slaves come to you seeking penance, do not oppress them, nor make them fast as much as the wealthy, because male and female slaves are not free agents; therefore impose half the usual penance on them.'<sup>36</sup> Thus the notion becomes explicit, that unlike those whose capacity to judge is reduced by poverty, ignorance, lack of experience and fear, the slave is limited because his life is controlled by another. Penitential books of the ninth and tenth centuries repeat this judgment that the slave is not of full moral responsibility and should not be punished as though he were. The notion would continue in the canonical collections,<sup>37</sup> and would receive a remarkable statement in the *Summa* of Hostiensis

<sup>33</sup> For remarkable examples dealing with the degrees of responsibility of those taking part in military operations, see Reginon of Prüm (ca. 906), ed. F. G. A. Wasserschleben, *Reginonis abbatis prumiensis Libri duo de synodalibus causis et disciplinis ecclesiasticis* 1.304 (Leipzig, 1840), p. 142; a letter of Gregory V (998): see Gratian, *Decretum*, C.12 q.2 c.8; the penitential articles touching those who fought in the battle of Hastings, issued 1067x1070 (*Councils & Synods* 1 2.583-84). Cf. Joseph Vogt, *Ancient Slavery and the Ideal of Man*, trans. Thomas Wiedermann (Oxford, 1974), pp. 104-105.

<sup>34</sup> *The Irish Penitentials*, ed. Ludwig Bieler (Scriptores latini Hiberniae 5; Dublin, 1963), pp. 112-13, 116-17, 127-29.

<sup>35</sup> 'Non omnibus ergo in una eademque libra pensandum est, licet in uno constringantur vitio, sed discretio sit unumquodque eorum, hoc est inter divitem et pauperem, liber, servus, infans, puer, juvenis, aduliscens, etate senex, ebitis, gnarus, laicus, clericus, monachus ...' (ed. F. G. A. Wasserschleben, *Die Bussordnungen der abendländischen Kirche* [Halle, 1851], p. 232). A similar phrase occurs in the closely related *Penitential of Bede*, *ibid.*, p. 250. On these texts see Pierre J. Payer, *Sex and the Penitentials. The Development of a Sexual Code 550-1150* (Toronto, 1984), pp. 16-17. Note that poverty is one of the causes of limited responsibility; see below, pp. 478-83.

<sup>36</sup> 'Et hoc scitote fratres, ut dum venerint ad vos servi vel ancille querentes penitentiam, non eos gravetis, neque cogatis tantum jejunare quantum divites, quia servi et ancille non sunt in sua potestate. Ideoque medietatem penitentiae eis imponite' (ed. Hermann J. Schmitz, *Die Bussbücher und die Bussdisciplin der Kirche nach handschriftlichen Quellen dargestellt* [Mainz, 1883], p. 243). Cf. *The Penitential of Halitgar* (817x30), ed. H. J. Schmitz, *Die Bussbücher und das kanonische Bussverfahren nach handschriftlichen Quellen dargestellt II* (Düsseldorf, 1898; rpt. Graz, 1958), p. 292.

<sup>37</sup> e.g., Burchard of Worms, *Decretum* (1008-12), 17.32, 34 (PL 140.925); Ivo of Chartres,

(1253) where, after an extended discussion of the circumstances of a sin, the author concludes that quality of person is the principal circumstance to be established in judging. The case of the *servus* who sins in executing his lord's command is used as the example of diminished responsibility and, therefore, of lesser punishment.<sup>38</sup> The meaning of the term *servus* in the context in which Hostiensis wrote is not clear: it may refer to a slave, or to a person of less restricted right, or to both, because both would be within his experience in the Italy of his time and the principle of diminished responsibility would apply to each of them.<sup>39</sup> From all of this it can be concluded that, in those cases where the offence was caused at least in part by the situation in which his lord had placed him, the sexual sins of a slave or a serf would be seen as less serious than a similar action by a free man. As a consequence the argument, that the slave or serf was considered to have a right to marry so that he might avoid sin by channeling his sexual appetite in a suitable manner, would lose some of its power.

Yet, however their limited responsibility was explained or justified, Christian slaves were not looked upon as persons incapable of moral acts.<sup>40</sup> Rights and duties flowed from that fact: they were expected to pursue a life of virtue. With the passage of time, the *servus*<sup>41</sup> was frequently discussed from this point of view in the writings of religious leaders. Regulations to ensure the possibility of the life of virtue were issued in councils and soon found their place in canonical collections. Some of these rules became part of Roman and barbarian law as well.<sup>42</sup> First, the slave's religious needs were to be respected: he was to be allowed Sunday rest and be free to attend mass that day; he was to observe fasts in their season. Efforts were made to protect the faith of the servile class: they were not to pass under the control of

*Decretum* (1100), 9.90 (PL 161.682); *Decretum Gratiani*, C.22 q.5 c.2. Cf. *De judiciis omnium peccatorum* 8.30 (ed. Schmitz, *Die Bussbücher und das kanonische Bussverfahren*, p. 501).

<sup>38</sup> 'Licet autem omnes circumstantie diligenter sint attendende, principaliter tamen considerande sunt qualitates personarum; nam si servus sit, et timore peccaverit obediendo domino in atrocioribus mitius puniendus est . . . et tamen in talibus non tenebatur obedire' (*Summa, una cum summariis et adnotationibus* 5.60 [Lyons, 1537; rpt. Aachen, 1962], fol. 283vb). Note that the author points out that the *servus* is not bound to obey such an order.

<sup>39</sup> In his treatment of the different penances assigned to *libri* and *servi* in the context of England or northern France (1208-13), William of Flammesbury was clearly referring to serfs: *Liber poenitentialis. A Critical Edition with Introduction and Notes*, ed. J. J. Francis Firth (Studies and Texts 18; Toronto, 1971), pp. 229, 247.

<sup>40</sup> J. Dutilleul, 'Esclavage', *DTC* 51 (1924) 457-519, especially 474-75.

<sup>41</sup> For the remainder of this essay, where the meaning is uncertain, the term *servus/servi* will be used with purposeful indefiniteness, to describe those members of the lowest level of society to which the evidence under discussion refers. The terms 'slave' or 'serf' will be used where the meaning of the original is clear.

<sup>42</sup> See Dockès, *La libération médiévale*, p. 117. For a detailed study of the place of the slave in legislation, see David A. E. Pelteret, *Late Anglo-Saxon Slavery. An Inter-Disciplinary Approach to Various Forms of Evidence* (Diss. Toronto, 1976), pp. 107-53.

pagan or Jew. It became established that the *servus* should be allowed to control the movable property that he acquired under certain conditions; eventually, when he could properly be called 'serf', that power extended to the giving of alms at death, and the long debate between Church leaders and the seigniorial class over his right to make a will began.<sup>43</sup> Further evidence of the serious role of religion in the life of the slave is provided by his access to those rites — in time, they were identified as sacraments — which touched him personally, rites that enabled him to enter or re-enter the Church and to participate in its principal religious act, the eucharist. The rites that had social consequences, however, were treated differently: the *servus* was not to receive orders for he did not have that control of his person which was deemed necessary for the clerical state;<sup>44</sup> similarly, his marriage, real though it was judged to be, was seen to be limited in some respects by the rights of his lord.

When the requirements of the Christian life are approached from the point of view of the avoidance of sin, the writings of the Fathers show concern with helping the slave avoid sexual temptation.<sup>45</sup> Furthermore, however careful the penitential books were to point out the limitation of the slave's accountability for evil acts, they did not absolve him of all responsibility. It was in this literature that the first developed Christian statement on sexual sin was made: there was a refined examination of extenuating circumstances, but it is clear that the principle from which the moralists proceeded was the acceptance of the notion that only heterosexual relationships were permitted and that they were to be within marriage.<sup>46</sup> It is also clear that the slave was considered to be bound by this code. The insistence that the slave have access to a legitimate spouse is probably to be explained, at least in part, by the desire to protect him or her from the occasion of sin in the situation where sexual desire could not otherwise be assuaged in a

<sup>43</sup> See Michael M. Sheehan, *The Will in Medieval England from the Conversion of the Anglo-Saxons to the End of the Thirteenth Century* (Studies and Texts 6; Toronto, 1963), pp. 253-54. After 1102, this is the only matter touching slave or serf that is found in *English Councils and Synods* (above, n. 21); Bloch, 'Personal Liberty and Servitude', 43-44.

<sup>44</sup> See Naz, 'Esclave', 3: 'L'esclave et les ordres sacrés', DDC 5 (1954) 453-54; see Gratian, D.54 cc.1-24.

<sup>45</sup> See the texts assembled by Paul Allard, *Les esclaves chrétiens depuis les premiers temps de l'église jusqu'à la fin de la domination romaine en Occident* (Paris, 1914), pp. 251-60: Clement of Alexandria (ca. 200) warns women to be modest in the presence of their male slaves and advises husbands to avoid embracing their wives in the sight of their slaves lest the latter become excited; John Chrysostom (ca. 400) preaches that slave owners must arrange the marriage of slaves to assuage their sexual desire; etc.

<sup>46</sup> See Payer, *Sex and the Penitentials*, pp. 19-54, 115-22. A useful assemblage of these texts is available in John T. McNeill and Helena M. Gamer, eds., *Medieval Handbooks of Penance. A Translation of the Principal 'Libri Poenitentiales' and Selections from Related Documents* (Records of Civilization, Sources and Studies 29; New York, 1938); see Index, s.v. 'Slaves', 'Servitude', pp. 473-74.



morally acceptable way.<sup>47</sup> The caveat touching the limitation on the freedom of marriage resulting from the rights of lordship somewhat weakens this argument but, as will be seen, that limitation was to be removed as the theology of marriage was given its full statement towards 1200. It was precisely at this point — the confrontation of marital and seigniorial rights — that the argument was located.

## 2. *The Right to Marry*

The process whereby it became established that a slave was capable of marriage, with rights and obligations as understood by the Church, was long and complex. The development was often local and rarely continuous; there were setbacks and inconsistencies. Its investigation has proved difficult not least because of the problems presented by the meaning of terms: the scholarly method of both canonist and theologian required the examination, interpretation and rendering consistent of texts that came from the past. In many of those texts terms such as *servus*, *ancilla*, *servilis conditio*, etc. undoubtedly referred to slaves in their original context. But their meaning in a treatise or business document of the high Middle Ages is often a problem for the modern reader as it was for medievals themselves.<sup>48</sup> Nevertheless the 'marriage' of the slave has long been of interest to scholars and much progress has been made in its understanding.<sup>49</sup> It soon becomes clear that it is best to proceed by distinguishing two principal problems. Their solutions developed in somewhat different ways but, by and large, complemented each other. First, there was the question with which the marriage of the slave appeared in Christian literature, namely, that union of a free woman and her slave counte-

<sup>47</sup> The Penitentials were especially concerned with the protection of the female slave: see the preceding note.

<sup>48</sup> Pascal II (1099-1118) reflected on this matter in a letter confirming the right of the serfs of the Church of Paris to witness in court against freemen: 'pro eo quod ipsius ecclesiae famuli, qui apud vos servi vulgo improprie nuncupantur. . . ' (cited by Dutilleul, 'Esclavage', 480). See John Gilchrist, 'Saint Raymond of Penyafort and the Decretalist Doctrines on Serfdom', *Escritos del Vedat* 7 (1977) 303-307 and John W. Baldwin, *Masters, Princes and Merchants. The Social Views of Peter the Chanter and His Circle*, 2 vols. (Princeton, 1970), 1.237-38.

<sup>49</sup> Allard, *Les esclaves chrétiens*, pp. 247-75 (a good collection of texts; the author's interpretation is to be used with caution); Pierre Bernard, *Étude sur les esclaves et les serfs d'église en France du VI<sup>e</sup> au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1919), pp. 55-57; Jean Dauvillier, *Le mariage dans le droit classique de l'église depuis le Décret de Gratien (1140) jusqu'à la mort de Clément V (1314)* (Paris, 1933), pp. 94-97, 185-88; Adhémar Esmein, *Le mariage en droit canonique*, 2nd edition by Robert Génestal and Jean Dauvillier, 2 vols. (Paris, 1929-35), 1.350-70; Freisen, *Geschichte des canonischen Eherechts*, pp. 58-71; Andrés E. de Mañaricua y Nuere, *El matrimonio de los esclavos. Estudio histórico jurídico hasta la fijación de la disciplina en el derecho canónico* (Analecta gregoriana 23, Series Facultatis Juris Canonici, Sectio B, 1; Rome, 1940); Fabien Thibault, 'La condition des personnes en France du IX<sup>e</sup> siècle au mouvement communal', *RHDFE*, 4th Ser., 12 (1933) 448-62; Charles Verlinden, 'Le "mariage" des esclaves' in *Il matrimonio nella società altomedievale*, 2 vols. (Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo 24; Spoleto, 1977), 2.569-601.

nanced by St. Cyprian. Second, there was the more straightforward question of the slave's capacity for marriage and, that being granted, whether he could, in fact, enjoy the full rights that were considered to belong to that state.

With regard to the first, the marriage that sought to cross the free-slave barrier, it is clear that, however much both Roman and barbarian societies were willing to permit such a ménage, there was no question of marriage between the principals. There was also a powerful current in the early Church against such a union.<sup>50</sup> The Pauline text touching the rejection of the slave-girl and her son by Abraham (Gal 4:31) was not without effect, whatever Pope Callixtus may have decided. The possibilities of abuse were patent and Christian thinkers were slow to agree that a concubine could be a wife.<sup>51</sup> But as the marital capacity of the slave became clarified in Frankish councils of the eighth and ninth centuries,<sup>52</sup> attention shifted to the question of the possibility of a marriage where, by intent or in ignorance, there was error as to the status of the spouses. Echoes of the more fundamental question touching the radical incapacity of the slave for marriage remained, but the principal discussion beginning with the eleventh century was about the validity of a marriage where this error existed. Esmein has described how, at an earlier date when the Church's teaching on the indissolubility of marriage was only partially formed, such unions were sometimes terminated by divorce but, once the strict rules on the permanence of the marriage bond had been arrived at, another approach became necessary.<sup>53</sup>

Wrestling with the problem, Peter Lombard fell back on the notion that there was an intrinsic quality in the servile condition which somewhat limited capacity for marriage, a limitation that could be overcome if the spouses knew and accepted each other's status.<sup>54</sup> It was the notion that error of condition rendered a union

<sup>50</sup> See Esmein, *Le mariage* 1.356-58.

<sup>51</sup> Freisen, *Geschichte des canonischen Eherechts*, pp. 58-91. See the important general discussion of the matter in Brundage, 'Concubinage and Marriage', 1-17; note the bibliography, pp. 14-17.

<sup>52</sup> Esmein relates this development to the improved status of the slave in Frankish society (*Le mariage* 1.359). Writing on the subject ca. 1138, Walter of Mortagne noted that in Roman law and in the practice of some churches *conjugium* was denied the union of *liber* and *ancilla* but that some churches had not received this regulation, 'sicut in multis ecclesiis Gallicanis fit frequenter libero retinente libertatem et servo servitutem' (*De conjugio*, published as Hugh of St. Victor, *Summa sententiarum* [PL 176.165-66]; see Edward A. Synan, 'Walter of Mortagne' in *New Catholic Encyclopedia* 14 [New York, 1965], p. 790).

<sup>53</sup> Esmein, *ibid.* 1.359-63; note the evolution of the thinking of Ivo of Chartres (*ibid.*, pp. 360-62).

<sup>54</sup> In Bk.4 D.34 c.1, discussing those legally capable of marriage, the Lombard notes that some are rendered 'nec plene legitimæ, nec omnino illegitimæ' for marriage 'per frigiditatem' and 'per conditionem' (*Magistri Petri Lombardi parisiensis episcopi Sententiae in IV libris distinctae*, 2 vols. [Spicilegium bonaventurianum 4-5; Grottaferrata, 1971-81], 2.462-63). Later, Bk.4 D.36 c.1, he observes that, if the servile condition is known and there is consent, the marriage is indissoluble (2.473). See Esmein, *Le mariage* 1.363-64.

invalid that was to hold the future, but such a position was not received without opposition. Thus Peter Cantor, writing in the last decade of the twelfth century, admitted that canonists taught that there was no marriage where error of condition occurred, but held that it was valid. Noting that it would be worse to cohabit with a leper than with a person of servile condition, and that error about leprosy did not invalidate a marriage, he insisted that he could not see how error of condition would do so either.<sup>55</sup> Thomas of Chobham, one of the Cantor's students writing a generation later, posed the same objection, but he returned to that older notion suggested by Peter Lombard, namely, that servitude was more intrinsic to human nature and was thus a greater impediment than other kinds of error. Chobham's conclusion disagreed with that of his master.<sup>56</sup>

After much discussion, it was accepted in the jurisprudence of the thirteenth century that the union of free and unfree, whether brought about in error or by deceit, was invalid where the free spouse was the one misled.<sup>57</sup> This understanding of the marriage of slave and free would continue in Roman canon law until it was removed in the new code of 1983, a chilling reminder of the fact of slavery in the modern world.<sup>58</sup>

It is difficult to know to what extent the discussion at the beginning of the thirteenth century applied to the marriage of serf and free. The survival of the notion in the canon law of the modern Church is a strong indication that application to the slave was one of the intended meanings. It is clear enough that the *servus*, who was a serf, was no longer rightless, nor was he a chattel of his master even though he might be transferred to another lord with the land he worked. Some canonists make it clear that they consider the serf to be free of this restriction, a position that might be in accord with the position of Peter Cantor, even though in the latter case it was question of the validity of the marriage of an

<sup>55</sup> *Summa de sacramentis et animae consiliis*, ed. Jean-Albert Degauquier, 5 vols. (Analecta mediaevalia namurcensia 4, 7, 11, 16, 21; Louvain, 1954-67), 3.294-95.

<sup>56</sup> 'Ad hoc dicendum quod servitus magis est de statu hominis, et quasi de substantia hominis magis quam aliud accidens, et ideo error servitutis magis impedit quam alius error' (*Thomae de Chobham Summa confessorum*, ed. F. Broomfield [Analecta mediaevalia namurcensia 25; Louvain, 1968], p. 176).

<sup>57</sup> See Dauvillier, *Le mariage*, pp. 94-97; Esmein, *Le mariage* 1.367-70; Friedrich Merzbacher, 'Die Bedeutung von Freiheit und Unfreiheit im weltlichen und kirchlichen Recht des deutschen Mittelalters', *Historisches Jahrbuch* 90 (1970) 274-78.

<sup>58</sup> See the *Code* of 1917, c.1083, 2: 'Error circa qualitatem personae, etsi det causam contractui, matrimonium irritat tantum: 1. Si error qualitatis redundet in errorem personae. 2. Si persona libera matrimonium contrahat cum persona quam liberam putat, cum contra sit serva, servitute proprie dicta' (*Codex iuris canonici* [Vatican City, 1936], p. 297). (Note that 'serva' is interpreted as 'slave'.) The new *Code* of 1983 is more subtle, but still recognizes difference of condition: c.1097, 2: 'Error in qualitate personae, etsi det causam contractui, matrimonium irritum non reddit, nisi haec qualitas directe et principaliter intendatur' (*Codex iuris canonici auctoritate Iohannis Pauli pp. II promulgatus* [Vatican City, 1983], p. 213).

*ancilla* whose status was erroneously perceived.<sup>59</sup> Chobham, writing in England where slavery was virtually unknown in the thirteenth century, used the same term but opted for the impediment. The perennial question returns, whether he was referring to the situation that he observed around him or was simply dealing with an old problem and using old terms with their old meaning, namely, the marriage of a slave and a freeman. The answer to this question will be found in the records of the manorial and ecclesiastical courts and may well show local variations. Evidence available thus far suggests that the limitation did not apply to marriages involving the free and the serf, an impression reinforced by the understanding of the marital rights of the serf to which Christian thinkers had come by the beginning of the thirteenth century.

Where it was question of two slaves, Church leaders slowly developed the notion that they were capable of marriage as was any other Christian.<sup>60</sup> By and large, it was agreed that the consent of the owner of the slave was needed for the union to be accepted. But, even if the fact of the relationship were accepted, the possibility that the couple might exercise true marital and parental rights, might live together, care for their children, etc. was frequently denied.<sup>61</sup> By Carolingian times it is clear that local councils were much concerned with this element of the marriage of *servi* and, in the period when marriage law and theology were assuming their fully developed form, the period in which slavery disappeared in much of Europe, the final steps in doctrine on the matter were taken: much as the consent of the lord was desired, it was decided that the servile class was free to marry and live in the married state even where the lord was opposed to their doing so.

The discussion proved to be a complex one and several decades passed before it came to a reasonably consistent resolution. As mentioned above (p. 469), since the debate involved ancient texts and terminology connoting 'slave' rather than 'serf', the matter is clouded for the modern student as it clearly was on occasion for the canonists and theologians of the time. The very texts of Scripture could be used to support various positions. Thus Peter's 'Servants, be submissive to your masters' assumed considerable importance (1 Pet 2:18). (The operative term in the Vulgate was '*servi*' = slaves/serfs/servants.) At the same time the notion of the fundamental equality of men stated by Heimrad, when he quoted St. Paul's Letter to the Galatians,<sup>62</sup> and the permanence of the marital relationship implied by

<sup>59</sup> Above, n. 55. Note that he used the term '*ancilla*' for the woman whose status was questioned.

<sup>60</sup> See above, n. 49.

<sup>61</sup> Reginon of Prüm (ca. 906), citing Roman law (CT 2.25), noted in this regard that the position of the *servus* was worse in his time than it had been in the late Empire (*Libri duo de synodalibus causis* 1.22, p. 120).

<sup>62</sup> A nice example is provided by the reinforcement of a text of Justinian allowing the union of a man and a slave (*alumna*), whom he had freed: *Cod.* 5.4.26, purporting to be a letter to a Pope Julianus, resolves the ambiguity by allowing the marriage. When the text appears in the *Decretum* of

Christ's words 'Whatever therefore God has joined together, let no man put asunder' (Mc 10:9) frequently played a part in the discussion. An important shift of perspective is soon evident. Whereas in Carolingian literature the thrust of conciliar canons was to state the right of the *servus* to marry and to protect his marriage from the massive claims of the lord, the general impression given by the literature discussing the matter after 1100 is that certain marital rights of the *servi* were taken as acquired. There was still a problem, but it was stated in a different way: how to reconcile two sets of rights that could easily come into conflict. Fortunately for the purpose of this study, much progress has been made in the analysis of the position of the married serf vis-a-vis his lord in articles by Peter Landau and John Gilchrist.<sup>63</sup>

Theologians of the mid-twelfth century had been precocious in stressing the freedom of children from the control of their parents in their choice of spouse.<sup>64</sup> As Landau shows, however, they were reluctant to assume the same position with regard to the serf's freedom from seigniorial control. The obvious question to ask was whether the lord's permission were necessary for the validity of the marriage. About 1138, in a discussion of servile marriage in his *De conjugio*, Walter of Mortagne, a theologian of the school of Laon, based his analysis of this problem on a text of the Carolingian council held at Châlons in 813. Citing Christ's words 'Quod Deus coniunxit, homo non separet' (Mt 19:6), the conciliar canon went on to say that, where there had been a proper marriage with the consent of the lord, the *servi* couple should remain married while rendering their services.<sup>65</sup> Walter asked whether the lord's consent were necessary for such a marriage. He concluded

Burchard of Worms (ca. 1010), it is presented as a letter of Pope Julius (337-352), and the following, a tissue of texts that include references to Mt 6:1-9, 23:9, 1 Cor 12:13, Gal 3:28 and Eph 6:8, is added: 'Omnibus vobis unus est pater in coelis, et unusquisque dives et pauper, liber et servus, aequaliter pro se, et pro animabus eorum rationem daturi sunt. Quapropter omnibus cujusunque conditionis sint, unam legem, quantum ad Deum, habere non dubitamus' (9.18 [PL 140.818]). See Ivo of Chartres, *Decretum* 8.156, and *Panormia* 6.38 (PL 161.618, 1251); Gratian, C.29 q.2 cc. 1, 3. Regarding this text and its appearance in 'Polycarpus' 6.4.8, see Jean Gaudemet, 'Le legs du droit romain en matière matrimoniale' in *Il matrimonio nella società altomedievale* 1.156-59.

<sup>63</sup> Peter Landau, 'Hadrians iv. Dekretale "Dignum est" (X.4.9.1) und die Eheschliessung Unfreier in der Diskussion von Kanonisten und Theologen des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts', *Studia gratiana* 12 (1967) 511-53; John Gilchrist, 'The Medieval Canon Law on Unfree Persons: Gratian and the Decretist Doctrines c. 1141-1234', *ibid.* 19 (1976) 271-301, and 'Saint Raymond of Penyafort', 299-327.

<sup>64</sup> See Le Bras, 'La doctrine', 2139-49, 2151-57 (above, n. 9); Fossier, *Histoire sociale*, pp. 158-59.

<sup>65</sup> 'Dictum est quod nobis quidam matrimonia legitima potestativa quadam praesumptione dirimant, non attendentes illud Evangelicum: *Quod Deus conjunxit homo non separet* (Mt xxx). Unde visum est nobis ut conjugia servorum non dirimantur, etiam si diversos dominos habeant; sed in uno conjugio permanentes dominis serviant suis. Et hoc in illis servandum est ubi legalis conjunctio fuit et per voluntatem dominorum' (PL 176.166); cf. Gratian, C.29 q.2 c.8.

that, if the lord were unaware of the union and thus had not opposed it, it seemed reasonable that the marriage should stand.<sup>66</sup> Though on other matters Walter's text was the basis of Peter Lombard's treatment of servile marriage in his *Sentences* (ca. 1150), Peter came down firmly on requiring the lord's consent, merely reporting that 'it seemed to certain people' that, if the lord were ignorant, there would be a marriage.<sup>67</sup> Typical of the theological writers of the time, Gandulph of Bologna came to the same conclusion in his commentary on the *Sentences* (1160x70). But a limitation of seigniorial authority was provided by his additional question: if the lord can impose continence on his *servus* by forbidding his marriage, can he require him to assume the life of continence by entering a monastery or can he force him to marry? Here the reply is in the negative. For the acts in question, the consent of the serf was required; the lord's power was not unlimited: he might stand in the way of marriage but he could not cause it.<sup>68</sup> (Note, too, that the choices were either continence or marriage; there was no question of an intermediate state suitable for the serf.) Among other theologians, the right of the lord to prevent the serf's marriage would be held well into the thirteenth century.<sup>69</sup>

At first, canonists assumed a similar position. Thus, in C.29 of his *Decretum* (ca. 1140), Gratian left no doubt that the serf could marry, but insisted on the necessity of the lord's consent. The second question opens with a canon ascribed to Pope Julius asserting the capacity of the *servus* for marriage. Remarking that the free and the slave have one Father in heaven and must render an account for their actions, the pope is made to state that the serf, like the freeman, cannot dismiss his spouse once he has entered into a marriage.<sup>70</sup> After a citation of other canons exploring the problem of error of status in a marriage involving freeman and *servus*, the *quaestio* is completed by the text from the Council of Châlons quoted by Walter of Mortagne: married serfs are expected to serve their lords but their marriage is a true marriage if their lords consent to it.<sup>71</sup> The first generation of decretists in

<sup>66</sup> '... videtur tamen rationabiliter quod inter eos possit fieri conjugium si ex communi consensu copulentur, quamvis eorum domini ignoraverint' (PL 176.166).

<sup>67</sup> Bk.4 D.36 c.2 (*Sententiae* 2.474).

<sup>68</sup> '...non tamen potest contra voluntatem servi ipsum compellere ... uxorem ducere, cum ista sine ipsius servi consensu ab eo fieri non possunt' (*Magistri Gandulphi bononiensis Sententiarum libri quatuor*, ed. I. de Walter [Vienna, 1924], pp. 561-62). This discussion was of practical importance for lords sometimes applied pressure on their serfs to marry, at once evidence of the need that a servile tenement be held by a couple and of the acceptance of the notion that they should be married: see Elaine Clark, 'The Decision to Marry in Thirteenth- and Early Fourteenth-Century Norfolk', *Mediaeval Studies* 49 (1987) 496-516; Rodney H. Hilton, *The English Peasantry in the Later Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1975), p. 108; Richard M. Smith, 'Some Reflections on the Evidence for the Origins of the "European Marriage Pattern" in England' in *The Sociology of the Family*, pp. 87-88.

<sup>69</sup> See Landau, 'Hadrians iv.', 542-43.

<sup>70</sup> The glosses on this canon are discussed by Gilchrist in 'The Medieval Canon Law on Unfree Persons', 290-92. See above, n. 62.

<sup>71</sup> C.29 q.2 c.8.

their comments on these texts does not seem to have added anything of importance to Gratian's doctrine.<sup>72</sup> The practical problem of conflicting rights remained.

It was with the decretal *Dignum est* of Hadrian IV (1155-59) that the possibility suggested by Walter of Mortagne about twenty years before was realized. Quoting the Pauline text used by Heimrad, 'In Christo Jesu neque liber, neque servus est', the pope stated that since neither freeman nor *servus* was to be denied the sacraments of the Church, marriage between *servi* should not be forbidden. The decretal ended with a sentence that was to provide the main subject of the discussion for the next hundred years: though the lord should not prevent the marriage of *servi*, the customary services to which they were obliged ought to be rendered to their own masters.<sup>73</sup> The practical problem faced by the ménage made up of *servi* of different masters was posed.<sup>74</sup> In the discussion that followed it becomes clear that the *servi* in question were serfs.

*Dignum est* quickly found its way into those compilations of papal letters known as the Decretal Collections<sup>75</sup> and was included in Bernard of Pavia's *Breviarium extravagantium* (1188x92). This, one of the early systematic collections and more commonly known as the *Compilatio prima*, provided the design and the basic set of texts for the great official collection, the *Decretales* issued by Gregory IX in 1234. In the latter, *Dignum est* is the first canon in Title 9, 'De coniugio servorum'. The change that had come about in the century since the publication of Gratian's *Decretum* is remarkable. Whereas Gratian's texts made it clear that, if the lord consented to the marriage of a *servus*, it was a true marriage, the first canon of the *Decretales* stated that the lord's consent was not needed for the validity of such a union.<sup>76</sup> Bernard of Pavia also wrote a *Summa* that glossed the *Compilatio prima*. In his commentary on *Dignum est*, he reinforced Pope Hadrian's argument for the serf's freedom to marry, referring to the moral necessity for the right implied by St. Paul: 'But because of the temptation to immorality, each man should have his own wife and each woman her own husband' (1 Cor 7:2). As to the claim that the lord's consent to a marriage was required, he answered that it was fitting but not necessary.<sup>77</sup> Towards the middle of the thirteenth century, theologians such as Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas would lift the discussion to a new level with the doctrine that the exercise of the appetite which continues the human species

<sup>72</sup> Landau, 'Hadrians IV.', 515.

<sup>73</sup> '... debita tamen et consueta servitia non minus debent propriis dominis exhiberi' (X.4.9.1). On the ascription of *Dignum est*, see Landau, *ibid.*, 514-15.

<sup>74</sup> See Gilchrist, 'The Medieval Canon Law on Unfree Persons', 290-91.

<sup>75</sup> Landau, 'Hadrians IV.', 515.

<sup>76</sup> Cf. Gratian, C.29 q.2 c.1, and X.4.9.1.

<sup>77</sup> 'Hoc autem puto de honestate, potius quam de necessitate, cum etiam contradicentibus dominis possint ad invicem copulari' (*Bernardi papiensis Summa decretalium*, ed. Ernst A. T. Laspeyres [Regensburg, 1860; rpt. Graz, 1956], p. 154).

by generation pertains to the natural law. Since servitude is of positive law, it must yield to the former.<sup>78</sup>

By the time that the doctrinal dispute had been resolved, the examination of cases where rights of lord and serf were in conflict had long been under way. From the last decade of the twelfth century, the main point of discussion by both theologians and canonists was the right of the servile couple to live together as man and wife when it conflicted with the lord's right to their services. Was he permitted to separate them? Even when they were allowed to live together, did he have the right to make such demands of them as to make the mutual rendering of the marriage debt excessively difficult? Various ways for reuniting separated spouses were suggested. Peter Cantor went so far as to say that, in the case where a serf had fled to the city and the lord refused to allow his wife to follow him, she ought to do so for the marriage bond is to be preferred to the bond of servitude.<sup>79</sup> As to the question of the rights of married serfs and those of the lord, the discussion fell back on the distinction between marriages with and without permission; but usually in the background was the Pauline dictum 'But because of the temptation to immorality, each man should have his own wife and each woman her own husband.' Where the lord gave permission for his serf to marry, his consent to uninterrupted marital life was implied. But, where the marriage occurred without his permission, his demands were to be satisfied even though they made the marriage difficult, though not if they made it impossible. In most cases it was conceded that, if enforced continence posed the danger of adultery, the right of the lord was to yield before that of the marriage.<sup>80</sup>

### 3. *Establishing the Marriage Bond*

It might well be said that the concentration of discussion on the implementation of the serf's right to marriage by scholars, medieval as well as modern, has tended to focus attention too exclusively on the problems of the servile members of society. By the time that the fully developed doctrine on marriage was in place there was an ever increasing number of medievals who were considered to be free, but the poverty of whose lives made marriage difficult to bring about.<sup>81</sup> It is in the

<sup>78</sup> The texts are assembled by Landau, 'Hadrians iv.', 547-50.

<sup>79</sup> Vol. 3, pt. 2a, p. 295: '... ita uinculum matrimonii preferitur uinculo seruitutis. Unde ipsa tenetur si potest absque licentia domini fugere ad uirum'. Note that it is not simply that the wife *may* go; she *should* go. The moral dimension of the use of 'tenetur' is made all the clearer in the next part of the *casus* where a serf marries a free woman and she flees to her parents. If she cannot be convinced to return to her husband and he fears that either of them will fall into sin ('et timeret de lapsu suo uel uxoris'), then he should leave his lord and join her (p. 296).

<sup>80</sup> See Landau, 'Hadrians iv.', 543-52.

<sup>81</sup> It will be remembered that the penitential literature saw poverty as one of the causes of limited moral responsibility: see above, p. 468 and n. 35. In 'The Ecclesiastical Code of King Aethelred'



reflection on the manner of establishing the marital bond that some thought was given to them.

The developing Christian theory of marriage manifested a surprising combination of qualities: it became rather easy to create the marital union, but its consequences became very serious. The opposite was the case in Roman law: the establishment of *matrimonium iustum* was hedged about with many restrictions, yet the union was rather fragile, depending to the extent that it did on the will of the principals.<sup>82</sup> The point of view of Barbarian law was similar. The high seriousness of the commitment required by the Christian ideal involved not only exclusive sexual rights, the *fides* of Augustine, but it was also intended to be permanent. The actual implementation of such an ideal even within the rather small and highly motivated early Christian community was a slow and difficult matter. Within that group there are signs that the local community tended to exercise considerable control of the choice of spouse.<sup>83</sup> In addition, the bishop sometimes assumed a role in the marriage ritual.<sup>84</sup> After the peace of the Church, the reception of Christian teaching on the qualities of marriage by the population generally was even more difficult and dubious. Furthermore, it is clear that, in this wider context, Christian thinkers worked out the demanding consequences of the marital union before they gave serious thought to the manner in which the union was established. In fact it may well be that it was only after the consequences of Christ's words, 'What God has put together, let no man put asunder', had been examined that the Church realized the necessity of establishing criteria to decide what unions had, in fact, been established by God.<sup>85</sup>

It was at that point that the question of the manner of establishing the marital bond became of paramount importance. One of the reasons for St. Hippolytus'

(1014) c.6, the poor, be they slave or free, were seen to be in similar need: one third of the tithe was for 'God's poor and poor slaves' (*Councils and Synods I* 1.391). It was noted above, p. 464, that after 1102 the slave disappears from the English conciliar texts; the poor become the object of growing concern (*ibid.* 2.1131, s.v. 'poor, poverty', and *Councils and Synods with Other Documents Relating to the English Church II: A.D. 1205-1313*, 2 vols., ed. Frederick M. Powicke and Christopher R. Cheney [Oxford, 1964], 2.1404, 1430-35, s.v. 'almsgiving', 'mortuary', 'offerings', 'poor'). It is likely that, for much of Europe by the thirteenth century, poverty rather than servile condition was the more serious bar to marriage. See Fossier, *Histoire sociale*, pp. 241-45, 258-59 on the rise of rural and urban proletariats, and Jean Batany, 'Les pauvres et la pauvreté dans les revues des "états du monde"' in *Études sur l'histoire de la pauvreté*, 2 vols., ed. Michel Mollat (Publications de la Sorbonne, Sér. 'Études' 8; Paris 1974), 2.469-86.

<sup>82</sup> See Saller, 'Slavery and the Roman Family', 66-67.

<sup>83</sup> Ritzer, *Le mariage*, pp. 81-90; Paul Veyne, 'The Roman Empire' in *A History of Private Life*, vol. 1: *From Pagan Rome to Byzantium*, ed. Paul Veyne (Cambridge, Mass., 1987), pp. 263-65.

<sup>84</sup> See Ritzer, *ibid.*, pp. 110-21. For this and the following period see the dossier assembled by Cyrille Vogel in 'Les rites de la célébration du mariage: leur signification dans la formation du lien durant le haut moyen âge' in *Il matrimonio nella società altomedievale* 1.397-465.

<sup>85</sup> See Gaudemet, 'Le legs du droit romain', 143-50.

objection to the decisions of Pope Callixtus seems to have hinged on the lack of form in the marriages the latter was accused of accepting. This objection implied an expectation of formalities, and it is known that, in spite of the classical dictum that consent made marriage, much importance was attached to the contractual and formal elements of betrothal and marriage in Roman usage by the time of Callixtus' decision.<sup>86</sup> Similar insistence on formal processes of betrothal and marriage seems to have been common in regional customs of the various parts of the Empire and among the Germanic peoples as well.<sup>87</sup> As a rule, Church leaders accepted such formalities as a suitable way to establish the marriage bond.<sup>88</sup> An important indication of their increasing interest in this matter is to be seen in the decree of the Synod of Ver (755) that all lay marriages should be public.<sup>89</sup> By that time a Christian religious element was increasing in importance in the marriage customs of many parts of Europe.<sup>90</sup> Furthermore, and of major importance for the present discussion, the Church began to interest itself in the appropriateness of the proposed unions: were the couple free of previous marriage? were they related within forbidden degrees?<sup>91</sup>

Without exception, the various general descriptions of marriage formalities that are still extant, as well as the occasional accounts of particular weddings, attach much importance to setting out the stages whereby marital union was brought about.<sup>92</sup> Several of these occur in the middle years of the ninth century. All set out

<sup>86</sup> Ritzer, *Le mariage*, pp. 84-85. Cf. *Cod.* 5.1-12, 14-15; *Dig.* 23.1-2.

<sup>87</sup> Ritzer, *ibid.*, pp. 220-22, 267-72.

<sup>88</sup> Ritzer, *ibid.*, pp. 91-92, 94-97. See the descriptions of marriage formalities, below, n. 92.

<sup>89</sup> 'Ut omnes homines laici publicas nuptias faciant, tam nobiles quam innobiles' (c.5) (*Capitularia regum francorum*, ed. Alfredus Boretius [MGH *Legum* 2.1; Hanover, 1883], p. 36).

<sup>90</sup> See Ritzer, *Le mariage*, pp. 222-50, 273-84, 297-305, 307-25.

<sup>91</sup> Daudet, *Études sur l'histoire de la juridiction matrimoniale*, pp. 45-50; Jean Fleury, *Recherches historiques sur les empêchements de parenté dans le mariage canonique des origines aux fausses décrétales* (Paris, 1933), pp. 144-240. In the late Anglo-Saxon description of the procedure of betrothal and marriage described in the following note, there is provision for an examination of possible consanguinity between the couple.

<sup>92</sup> General descriptions of the formalities of betrothal and marriage are included in a letter of ca. 450 by Pope Leo I to Archbishop Rusticus of Narbonne (PL 67.288 [see the discussion of the text and critical problems related to it in Ritzer, *Le mariage*, pp. 286-87 and n. 251 and Joyce, *Christian Marriage*, pp. 56-57]); descriptions of ca. 850, among the Carolingian forgeries: one, among the *False Capitularies* of Benedict the Levite (*Benedicti capitularia* 3.463, ed. Friedrich H. Knust [MGH *Legum* 2.ii; Hanover, 1838; Leipzig, 1925], p. 132), and a second, ascribed to Pope Evaristus (97-105), in Pseudo-Isidore, *Decretales pseudo-isidorianae et capitula Angilramni*, ed. Paul Hinschius (Leipzig, 1863), pp. 87-88; the *responsa* of Pope Nicholas I to Boris, khan of the Bulgarians (866): *Ep.* 99, ed. Ernest Perels (MGH *Epp.* 6; Berlin, 1925), pp. 568-600; a text of ca. 1025, probably from the circle of Archbishop Wulfstan of York: 'Be wifmannes beweddunge' (ed. Felix Liebermann, *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, 3 vols. [Halle, 1903-16], 1.442-44). A description of the formalities of an individual marriage survives for the marriage (and coronation) of Judith, daughter of Charles the Bald, to Ethelwulf, king of the West Saxons, at Verberie (Oise) in 856 (*Capitularia regum francorum*, ed. Alfredus Boretius and Victor Krause [MGH *Legum* 2.2ii; Hanover, 1893], pp.

the different steps of the process in detail, and one of them underlines the importance of formalities which made such marriages acceptable to the lord and guaranteed the legitimacy of children and their right to inherit.<sup>93</sup> Included among these documents is a section from a long letter of 863 from Pope Nicholas I to Boris, khan of the Bulgarians. There, a point of view not found in the other accounts appears.<sup>94</sup> The pope described the marriage rituals as practised by the Roman Church. He also mentioned Boris' reminder that the Byzantine Church required the marriage take place with formalities and in a liturgical setting.<sup>95</sup> But the pope insisted that, desirable as it might be that consent of the members of the principals' circles be obtained and that various familial and religious rituals be observed, none was necessary for the union to be acceptable to the Church. Only one thing was required: the consent of the couple.<sup>96</sup> This tension between what is to be desired in the process by which a couple is united and the minimum that is needed for the marriage to be valid would be a problem all through the Middle Ages. From the present point of view, it is important to note that Pope Nicholas emphasized the reason for the Roman usage: some members of the community were simply too poor to be able to provide for the more formal wedding.<sup>97</sup>

When descriptions of marriage were made, they usually envisioned, as would be expected, the unions of important members of society. Among the wealthy and powerful, the contractual and formal elements of marriage were important for personal reasons as well as for family strategies of longer term. Thus, in spite of the adage of Roman law that a dowry was not necessary, the formalities and fact of endowment were clearly of major importance. For the servile members of society such pressures would not be operative. Yet, it is evident, from what has been noted above, that the expected permission of the lord or lords before the marriage of *servi*

425-27). In literature, the detailed description of the contractual and ritual elements of the courtship and marriage of the nephew of Ruodlieb and the daughter of the chatelaine, and the early stages of Ruodlieb's proposed marriage are in *Ruodlieb*, chaps. 10-12, 14, 16-17 (*Ruodlieb. The Earliest Courtly Novel (after 1050)*, ed. and trans. Edwin H. Zeydel [University of North Carolina Studies in Germanic Languages and Literatures 23; Chapel Hill, 1959], pp. 102-17, 122-27, 130-39).

<sup>93</sup> 'Taliter enim et domino placebunt et filios non spurios, sed legitimos, atque hereditabiles generantur' (*Decretales pseudo-isidorianae*, pp. 87-88).

<sup>94</sup> The phrase 'nisi voluntas propria subfragerit' may have been intended to provide a means to avoid the formalities described in the text attributed to Pope Evaristus, but Ritzer, *Le mariage*, p. 351, rejects the interpretation.

<sup>95</sup> On the requirement of formalities in the marriages of slaves and the poor in the Byzantine empire, see Angeliki E. Laiou, 'Consensus Facit Nuptias — Et Non: Pope Nicholas I's *Responsa* to the Bulgarians as a Source for Byzantine Marriage Customs', *Rechtshistorisches Journal* 4 (1985) 189-201 and Ritzer, *ibid.*, pp. 170-71.

<sup>96</sup> 'ac per hoc sufficiat secundum leges solus eorum consensus, de quorum coniunctionibus agitur' (MGH *Epp.* 6.570).

<sup>97</sup> '... praesertim cum tanta soleat artare quosdam rerum inopia, ut ad haec praeparanda nullum his suffragetur auxilium' (*ibid.*).

fitted well with the understanding that manifestation of wider consent should be one of the formalities of marriage. Probably it will not be possible to demonstrate the fact for *servi* of the ninth and following centuries but, when there is more evidence touching the marriage of serfs and the poor, it becomes clear that endowment was considered to be of importance among them. Sometimes it appears as the only means of proof for the existence of the marriage bond in either the internal or the external forum.<sup>98</sup> Yet important as formalities — be they of the simplest sort — may have been for the marriages of the poor, the teaching of Nicholas I, that they were not essential, was to be remembered.

By the time that evidence of the importance attached to endowment by the poor becomes available, the developed theology and law of marriage had long since turned once again to insist that between a man and a woman, not restricted by relationship or previous marriage or vow, all that was needed for valid union was their consent.<sup>99</sup> Coupled with this was the teaching on the potential spouse's freedom and right to choose a marriage partner and the concomitant notion that no other consent was necessary. It is not surprising that, precisely at this time, the right of the serf to marry, to share rights and obligations with his spouse and to control his children without the lord's consent and even against his wishes was finally established. It would be an error, however, to think that the various instruments of popular instruction, that were brought into action to support the sacramental teaching of the late twelfth and following centuries, emphasized the minimal requirement and the relative unimportance of all elements other than consent. Quite the contrary: they emphasized the importance of the ritual of marriage — a new religious ritual — as necessary for all.<sup>100</sup> But it is clear that the minimal requirement was understood, and there is abundant evidence that many unions were established without an act which included the rites of the Church and that they were considered to be valid. Thus the informal union came to be accepted as a true marriage, with all the serious consequences of that relationship, so long

<sup>98</sup> Thus in Burchard, *Decretum* 19.5, a confessor, enquiring about an alleged marriage, asks the penitent if he has not endowed his wife with at least a farthing: '... vel pretio unius oboli, tantum ut dotata fieret' (PL 140.958); on the use of the fact of endowment — even the gift of a kerchief — in ecclesiastical court as evidence of marriage, see Michael M. Sheehan, 'The Formation and Stability of Marriage in Fourteenth-Century England: Evidence of an Ely Register', *Mediaeval Studies* 33 (1971) 246-47.

<sup>99</sup> See Gérard Fransen, 'La formation du lien matrimonial au moyen âge' in *Le lien matrimonial*, ed. René Metz and Jean Schlick (Strasbourg, 1970), pp. 106-26.

<sup>100</sup> On the development and reception of the full religious ritual of marriage for the high Middle Ages, see Brian Bethune, *The Text of the Christian Rite of Marriage in Medieval Spain* (Diss. Toronto, 1986); Jean-Baptiste Molin and Protais Mutembe, *Le rituel du mariage en France du XII<sup>e</sup> au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Théologie historique 26; Paris, 1974); Michael M. Sheehan 'Marriage Theory and Practice in the Conciliar Legislation and Diocesan Statutes of Medieval England', *Mediaeval Studies* 40 (1978) 408-60.

as the required consent to live as man and wife was present when that union was established. Clearly, those theologians and canonists who had arrived at the fully developed theory of marriage saw it as realizable among all members of society, the free and the servile, the rich and the poor.

When information about individual marriages becomes available on a fairly large scale in the fourteenth century, it is discovered that there were many clandestine unions. There is no need to be surprised.<sup>101</sup> It is not so much a question of explaining the fact that there were so many informal marriages; rather the fact that needs explanation is that, once these unions were accepted as true marriages, such success occurred in leading the population to give them the public quality that the Church sought.<sup>102</sup> The whole weight of teaching by council and synod as well as the civil law of the twelfth and following centuries was to move members of all classes to establish their marital bond in a formal wedding before the Church, a liturgy that incorporated many of the older familial and civil rituals associated with marriage. It meant that a situation had been created in which it was easy for poorer members of society to establish an accepted union while, at the same time, instruments were developed to ensure that their unions moved beyond mere validity to that which was formal and public. The required formalities were intended both to ensure the couple's freedom to marry and to make it clear to the local ecclesial community that the union had taken place. Within those formalities there was no place for the lord to be involved. The peasant and the poor dwellers of the towns could marry if they wished and, as will be seen, if they merely wished to live together, the religious society was organized to turn that union into marriage.

Thus, when the different aspects of the Christian teaching on the marriage of the servile members of society are examined, it becomes clear that reflection on the moral obligation of all adult Christians, coupled with examination of the basis of the right to marriage and the theory of the essential element in creating the marital bond, led to the conclusion that it was not only possible but expected that the *servus* should be allowed to marry. That same reflection made marriage easier to achieve for those poorer members of society who enjoyed freedom but the condition of whose lives made the formalities of marriage difficult for them to fulfil. All in all, it is possible to discern from the third century onward a steady

<sup>101</sup> It is important to note that, though many marriages were considered 'clandestine' in the canonical sense of the term, it need not follow that the union was brought about without formalities: see the discussion of this matter in Sheehan, 'Formation and Stability of Marriage', 244-49; Juliette M. Turlan, 'Recherches sur le mariage dans la pratique coutumière (XI<sup>e</sup>-XVI<sup>e</sup> s.)', RHDfE, 4th Ser., 35 (1957) 503-16.

<sup>102</sup> Cf. A. Lefebvre-Teillard, 'Règle et réalité dans le droit matrimonial à la fin du moyen-âge', *Revue de droit canonique* 30 (1980) 41-54.

development of ideas and regulations, despite much variety and not infrequent inconsistency, that tended to enhance the completeness of the life of members of the servile classes and the poor. Though limitations to the moral responsibilities of these groups were recognized, there is clear evidence in the thinking of the time that, in principle, their exercise of sexual powers should be within the framework of a marriage that, essentially, was common to all Christians. This teaching was developed by the elements in society that were to produce the synthesis on sexuality, marriage and the celibate life that was one of the principal achievements in the social thinking of the high Middle Ages. In answer to the first question, namely, whether the theory of marriage developed by the end of the twelfth century were intended to apply to the servile classes and to the poor, a clear affirmative must be given.

### III

There is a second question, however. To what degree was the new theory of marriage actually implemented among the less fortunate men and women who constituted the vast majority of medieval society? One could expect resistance from slave owners or manorial lords (some of whom were the very persons who developed the theory in question) for an obvious threat to their prerogatives lay in this doctrine. In fact, there is abundant evidence of their efforts to maintain as many of their traditional rights as possible, while accommodating themselves to the new ideas on marriage. But the question exists at a more fundamental level: did *servi* and the poor desire, or could they be led to desire, to enter a relationship that was intended to be permanent and exclusive? It will be remembered how the disciples responded when Christ set out his doctrine on the indissolubility of marriage: 'If that is man's relation to his wife it is better not to marry' (Mt 19:10). Perhaps other arrangements were preferred: as has been seen above (p. 483), there is much evidence on the frequency of informal unions among members of the lowest classes; how often were they ended with equal informality?<sup>103</sup> How important was it in the mind of the peasant or the poor townsman that he marry?<sup>104</sup> It was noted that one of the elements of the discussion of the marital rights of the *servus* was the notion that marriage was necessary to him if he were to avoid sexual sin. On the other hand, there is abundant evidence in literature and elsewhere of that age-old notion, so consoling to men, that the continence of lower-class women

<sup>103</sup> See the suggestions of Richard H. Helmholz, *Marriage Litigation in Medieval England* (Cambridge, 1974), pp. 74-76 and Lefebvre-Teillard, *ibid.*, 50-54.

<sup>104</sup> See the important suggestions of Ariès, 'Le mariage indissoluble', especially pp. 133-34, and Fossier, *Histoire sociale*, pp. 96-97.

is not a very serious matter.<sup>105</sup> Yet it is clear that those in a position to control the instruments of opinion-forming and of formal teaching considered the matter very serious for all elements of the population.

First, it is evident from the confessor's handbooks which began to appear in large numbers early in the thirteenth century that a carefully enunciated code of sexual behaviour was becoming available to those whose duty it was to teach the people, that is, the parish clergy. Furthermore, this same literature, unlike the earlier Penitentials which had concentrated on sin and its correction, presented a well-balanced and positive doctrine on the meaning and purpose of sexuality and marriage.<sup>106</sup> Sermon literature is presently coming under examination and there is at least a suggestion that the doctrine on marriage was made available to parishioners on a regular basis.<sup>107</sup>

Furthermore, there is abundant evidence that pressures were brought to bear on all parish members to live in a proper nuptial relationship. (At the moment, because of the uneven publication of the texts of local councils and synods, this point can best be illustrated for England.) First, there was a series of episcopal statutes, beginning with the earliest set from Salisbury (1217x19) which required the priest to inquire carefully about the marital situations of parents when a child was presented for baptism, so that the legitimacy of the child could be recognized and, where necessary, fornicators punished. For the remainder of the thirteenth century, regulations of this sort appeared again and again.<sup>108</sup> Furthermore, it had

<sup>105</sup> See Duby, *Medieval Marriage*, pp. 12-14; Saller, 'Slavery and the Roman Family', 72, and the discussion by J. H. Plumb in his review of David B. Davis, *Slavery and Human Progress in The New York Review of Books* 31 (17 January 1985) 32. The penitential literature was much concerned with the sexual abuse of the female slave: see McNeill and Gamer, *Medieval Handbooks of Penance*, s.v. 'Female slave', p. 463.

<sup>106</sup> See Jacqueline Murray, *The Perceptions of Sexuality, Marriage, and Family in Early English Pastoral Manuals* (Diss. Toronto, 1987); Sheehan, 'Choice of Marriage Partner', 20-25; Josef G. Ziegler, *Die Ehelehre der Pönitentialsummen von 1200-1350. Eine Untersuchung zur Geschichte der Moral- und Pastoraltheologie* (Studien zur Geschichte der katholischen Moraltheologie 4; Regensburg, 1956).

<sup>107</sup> For an introduction to this important literature see: David L. d'Avray and M. Tausche, 'Marriage Sermons in Ad Status Collections of the Central Middle Ages', *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* 47 (1980) 71-119; David L. d'Avray, 'The Gospel of the Marriage Feast of Cana and Marriage Preaching in France' in *The Bible in the Medieval World. Essays in Memory of Beryl Smalley*, ed. Katherine Walsh and Diana Wood (Studies in Church History, Subsidia 4; Oxford, 1985), pp. 207-24, and *The Preaching of the Friars. Sermons Diffused from Paris before 1300* (Oxford, 1985), especially pp. 69-70, 249-50, 257-58; Jean Longère, *La prédication médiévale* (Paris, 1983), p. 215.

<sup>108</sup> 1 Salisbury 30: 'De inquisitione pueri (baptizandi). Diligenter querat sacerdos cuius sit puer baptizandus, quis pater, que mater, ut sic cognoscat et puniat fornicatores, et sic sciat qui legitimi, qui non. ... Et quoniam propter multas causas necesse est sacerdotem huiusmodi facere interrogationem, precipimus hoc statutum diligenter observari; puero autem nunquam denegetur baptismus' (*Councils and Synods* II 1.70; similarly 1 Exeter 18 [1225 x 37], 2 Salisbury 8 [1238 x 44], Durham

long been the custom during visitation that inquiry be made about the public sins of parishioners.<sup>109</sup> When directives for archidiaconal visitation became available in England in the middle of the thirteenth century, it is clear that supervision of marriages was one of their tasks.<sup>110</sup>

In these ways and as a result of *ex officio* proceedings in the bishops' courts, those found to be living together, but of whose marriage there was no *prima facie* evidence, were identified. They were subject to severe constraints to marry properly, if they were free to do so, or to separate. Those who refused to marry were sometimes threatened with a fine if they came together again. More drastic was the procedure by which those living in an improper union, though a true marriage was possible for them, were required to swear that further sexual relationship would constitute a marriage. This regulation began to appear in England in the statutes of Roger Niger, bishop of London (1229x41).<sup>111</sup> Thus it seems necessary to conclude that by the middle of the thirteenth century, in England at least, there were effective means for identifying the serf or any other member of society whose ménage was not judged a proper one and to require him to separate from his mate or marry her.

Several other arguments could be advanced in support of the proposition that procedures had been developed to educate the serf and the poor to an understanding of the new theory of marriage and to ensure that they embraced it. It will be enough to dwell briefly on but one of them, the one that, elsewhere, has been called the 'forbidden possibility'. Both the civil and religious orders were agreed that the exchange of consent and endowments that accompanied marriage should be made in a public ceremony. The motives of the two orders differed: for the civil

Peculiar 23 [1241x49?], 2 London 5 [1245x59], 2 Exeter 2 [1287]: *ibid.* 1.233, 369, 441, 635; 2.988).

<sup>109</sup> Thus the direction 'Deinde interrogandum de adulteriis et fornicationibus' in Reginon of Prüm, *Libri duo de synodalibus causis*, pp. 251 ff.

<sup>110</sup> The question 'An incontinentes sint correpti per archidiaconum loci, et quoties unusquisque sit correptus et qualiter', dated 1230 and ascribed to Hugh of Wells, bishop of Lincoln, in David Wilkins, ed., *Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae*, 4 vols. (London, 1737), 1.627, is probably derived from the Statutes of Robert Grosseteste: see *Councils and Synods II* 1.262 n. 2. Cf. no. 43, 'An adulteria, vel crimina publica laicorum sint rite per archidiaconum correcta; et si aliqua sint incorrecta?' (*Concilia* 1.628). The articles of inquiry in the diocese of Lichfield listed in the Burton Annals for 1252 included 'An adulteria et alia crimina publica sint alicubi corrigenda', and those for all of England in 1253 include 'An adulteria et crimina publica et notoria laicorum sint rite per archidiaconum correcta, et an aliquis contraxerit matrimonium in casu non concesso' (*Annales monastici*, 5 vols., ed. Henry Richard Luard [RS 36; London, 1864], 1.298, 309).

<sup>111</sup> See the discussion in Richard H. Helmholz, 'Abjuration *sub pena nubendi* in the Church Courts of Medieval England', *The Jurist* 32 (1972) 80-90; Sheehan, 'Marriage Theory and Practice', 446-48 and n. 60. Cf. Karen A. Corsano, *Custom and Consent: A Study of Marriage in Fourteenth Century Paris and Normandy, Based on the Records of the Ecclesiastical Courts* (Licentiate thesis, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1971), pp. 122-24.



order it was to ensure the successful transfer of property and guarantee the legitimacy of the children of the couple; for the Church it was to ensure that local knowledge of the couple saw no reason why they should not marry and to ensure remembrance of the fact that the marriage had taken place. Furthermore, councils and synods insisted again and again on the importance of a public exchange of consent under conditions worthy of the event.<sup>112</sup> Yet, through the high and late Middle Ages, the Church never tried to deny that the simple, more or less private, exchange of consent was a marriage. The Church might require those living in unions established in that way to exchange their vows *in facie ecclesie*, but it insisted that, if it could be shown that there was consent, the couple were man and wife from their first exchange of that consent. Thus, while there is much evidence that efforts were made to bring the wedding of the serf and of the poor to a level of formality that may have been unpleasant and too costly for them, at the same time the concept of marriage — indissoluble, exclusive, possessing rights that could override the claims of lordship — was applied to those humble unions which sometimes incorporated rituals that may well have come down from a time when the slave had little hope of establishing such a stable ménage, or consisted of nothing more than an exchange of consent.

\*  
\* \*

Towards the end of the fourteenth century, a period for which records of the ecclesiastical courts are fairly common, it is clear that a high proportion of marriages were the private, simple acts that were possible to even the poorest adult. As described in the record, these unions are patently considered to be indissoluble by those summoned before the court. The essential elements of the ideal of marriage had been rather successfully applied among the lower levels of society. Thus, it seems reasonable to conclude that the marital ideals and institutions, which were developed during the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, were intended to assure that the new theory and practice would become the model for the populace at large.

<sup>112</sup> It is clear that some marriages benefited from a degree of formality and publicity but were not of the seriousness that was deemed suitable: see the discussion of marriages in alehouses, etc. in Sheehan, *ibid.*, 415-17.

THE APOSTOLIC SEE  
AND  
THE ELECTIONS OF THE BISHOPS OF PERUGIA  
IN THE DUECENTO AND TRECENTO\*

*Giulio Silano*

ONE of the most ironical developments in the ecclesiastical history of the later Middle Ages was the redefinition of doctrine and practice concerning the election of bishops. Church reformers of the eleventh and twelfth centuries had identified the simoniacal election or appointment — or what they regarded as such — of members of the clergy as one of the principal causes of the decay of ecclesial life. They had decided that an effective means of averting the problem in the all-important case of the choice of bishops would be the restriction or elimination of lay involvement in episcopal elections. The free election of bishops by the chapters of canons of their cathedrals became one of the fundamental points of the programme of the reformers. The novel notion that cathedral canons should enjoy the exclusive right to elect bishops was at first resisted by the laity and by those sections of the clergy whose traditional rights in this matter were now being radically curtailed. By the middle of the thirteenth century, however, election by the chapter was more or less peacefully accepted as the normal road to the episcopate. The Papacy had been the foremost champion of this successful definition of the electoral rights of cathedral canons. It would also be the Papacy that would next proceed to the systematic exclusion of canons from episcopal elections; this exclusion would take place by way of the discovery in the successor of Peter, bearer of the *plenitudo potestatis*, of the unrestricted right to appoint all bishops.<sup>1</sup>

\* An earlier draft of this paper was read as a communication at the Congress, 'Società e istituzioni nell'Italia comunale: l'esempio di Perugia', Perugia, November 1985.

<sup>1</sup> The historiographical tradition on the question of papal provisions to ecclesiastical benefices and related issues is immense. A convenient and illuminating guide to the older studies is G. Barraclough, *Papal Provisions. Aspects of Church History Constitutional, Legal and Administrative in the Later Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1935). A recent discussion of the topic, with a very useful introduction to the glosses of canonists on the subject, is K. Pennington, *Pope and Bishops. The Papal Monarchy in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Century* (Philadelphia, 1984), pp. 115-53. On the particular aspect of provisions as they touched upon papal intervention in the elections of bishops, see G. Barraclough, 'The Making of a Bishop in the Middle Ages: The Part of the Pope in Law and Fact', *The Catholic*

The manner, motives, and effects of papal interference in episcopal elections have long been subjects of heated debate. Some contemporaries of the evolving process defended the necessity of papal involvement as a legitimate exercise of the *plenitudo potestatis*, and as the one certain way to assert and defend ecclesiastical liberty against the encroachments of lay powers and of their ambitious clerical servants. Others saw in the process the hand of a grasping Curia that suffered no scruples at undermining the traditional constitution of the local Church, and at severing long-standing relationships between bishops and local societies. Connected aspects of a fiscal nature and the disputed extent to which curial involvement was seen to encourage pluralism and absentee holding of ecclesiastical offices did nothing to cool the debate.<sup>2</sup> By way also of the conciliarist criticism of papal preferment to benefices, the issue found a prominent place in Protestant historiography into modern times. The Avignon Papacy is considered particularly responsible for the systematization of papal intervention in appointments to ecclesiastical offices; this has ensured that, even within Catholic historiography,

*Historical Review* 19 (1934) 275-319; on this same aspect, especially in reference to thirteenth-century developments, and for a survey of more recent literature on the subject, see K. Ganzer, *Papsttum und Bistumsbesetzungen in der Zeit von Gregor IX. bis Bonifaz VIII. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der päpstlichen Reservationen* (Forschungen zur kirchlichen Rechtsgeschichte und zum Kirchenrecht 9; Cologne-Graz, 1968). On the process of definition of the papal right to intervene in episcopal translations, renunciations, and depositions, see Pennington, *Pope and Bishops*, pp. 75-114. For the development of the common law in regard to capitular elections, see: Ganzer, *Papsttum und Bistumsbesetzungen*, pp. 9-27; J. Gaudemet, 'L'élection épiscopale d'après les canonistes de la deuxième moitié du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle' in *Le istituzioni ecclesiastiche della 'Societas Christiana' dei secoli XI-XII. Papato, cardinalato ed episcopato* (Atti della quinta settimana di studio, Mendola, 26-31 agosto 1971) (Miscellanea del Centro di studi medioevali 7; Milan, 1974), pp. 476-89. For the workings of the capitular electoral system in the Italian context, see M. Ronzani, 'Vescovi, capitoli e strategie famigliari nell'Italia comunale' in *La Chiesa e il potere politico dal Medioevo all'età contemporanea*, ed. G. Chittolini and G. Miccoli (Storia d'Italia. Annali 9; Turin 1986), pp. 101-46. For an introduction to the ecclesiological developments which underpin the papal development of the capitular electoral system and the eventual takeover by the Papacy of the right to elect, see M. Maccarrone, 'La teologia del primato romano del secolo XI' in *Le istituzioni ecclesiastiche della 'Societas Christiana'*, pp. 21-122; O. Capitani, 'Episcopato ed ecclesiologia nell'età gregoriana', *ibid.*, 316-73; G. Fransen, 'Papes, conciles, évêques du XII au XV siècle' in *Problemi di storia della Chiesa: il Medioevo dei secoli XIII-XV* (Milan, 1976), pp. 3-20; Pennington, *Pope and Bishops*, pp. 13-74.

<sup>2</sup> The principal contemporary defences of the papal role in regard to the provision to benefices are to be found in the numberless glosses by canonists on the pontifical texts which set out the principles for involvement. A good introduction to these writings is G. Le Bras, C. Lefèbvre, J. Rambaud, *L'âge classique (1140-1378). Sources et théorie du droit* (Histoire du droit et des institutions de l'Eglise en Occident 7; Paris, 1965); see also M. Wilks, *The Problem of Sovereignty in the Later Middle Ages. The Papal Monarchy with Augustinus Triumphus and the Publicists* (Cambridge, 1963) and Pennington, *Pope and Bishops*. The opinions of the contemporary critics of the papal system of provisions are canvassed and chastised in: L. Caillet, *La papauté d'Avignon et l'Eglise de France. La politique bénéficiaire du Pape Jean XXII en France (1316-1334)* (Paris, 1975), pp. 381 ff.; see also Ganzer, *Papsttum und Bistumsbesetzungen*, pp. 83-88.

supporters and opponents of the 'Babylonian Captivity' have reached somewhat different conclusions about the relative harm to ecclesial life caused by the curial control of appointments to benefices. Similarly discordant opinions have been formed concerning the relative novelty of the Avignonese Papacy's systematization of curial intervention in these matters.<sup>3</sup>

Papal law in regard to the election of bishops was developed gradually and was articulated around the concepts of postulation, vacancy 'apud Sedem Apostolicam,' and reservation. The first of these was a request to the pope, on the part of those who ordinarily had the right to elect, that he intervene in order to remove some impediment which stood in the way of their choice of a specific candidate. The possibility of postulation had not been unknown to Gratian who had foreseen the possibility of a direct appeal to a superior, whether pope or metropolitan, when a candidate desired by the people was, for some reason, ineligible for the office of bishop.<sup>4</sup>

Gratian not only had imposed some order on the ancient law of the Church, but had also made clear that the decretal letters of popes were to be regarded as a paramount source of new Church law. In the flurry of papal legislative activity which soon followed, decretal law took up more fully the question of what ought to be done if the ordinary electors should choose a candidate who did not fulfil all the canonical requirements, or who was already the bishop of another See. The answer given was that the electors could present a request to the pope for a dispensation from the observance of the normal canonical requirements in the specific instance, or for a separation of the candidate from his previous Church so that he might be joined to the one to which he had now been elected.<sup>5</sup> Because electoral law required that the election, in order to be effective, should be unanimous, a request for papal approval of a candidate was also to be presented in the case of discord among the ordinary electors.<sup>6</sup> In their commentaries upon the papal letters which outlined these requirements, the decretalists made clear that the effect of the postulation or request for dispensation was to confer a free and unrestricted right of election upon the pope; if, in his judicial capacity, he should find insufficient grounds for a dispensation, he would acquire the right, for the one time, to confer the office upon his own candidate; those who ordinarily would have had the right to elect would be excluded from the process.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Barraclough, *Papal Provisions*, passim; A. Vasina, 'Il periodo avignonese nella storiografia degli ultimi decenni' in *Aspetti culturali della società italiana nel periodo del papato avignonese* (Convegni del Centro di studi sulla spiritualità medievale 19; Todi, 1981), pp. 11-48. The classic study of the Avignon Papacy, especially for the aspects which concern us here, remains G. Mollat, *Les papes d'Avignon*, 9th edition (Paris, 1949).

<sup>4</sup> *Decretum*, Dist. 61 dictum post c. 10; Dist. 62 dictum ante c. 1 and c. 2.

<sup>5</sup> *Decretales Gregorii IX* (= X) 1.5.1, 2, 4, 6; 1.6.20; 1.7.2, 3, 4.

<sup>6</sup> X 1.6.22, 29, 36, 39, 55.

<sup>7</sup> *Glossa ordinaria ad X* 1.5.2, s. v. 'Providisti'; X 1.5.4.

The invention of the device of reservation proved to be a cornerstone of a coherent framework for papal intervention in appointments to ecclesiastical benefices. By this act, the pope reserved to himself election to a benefice or class of benefices not yet vacant for the time when the need should occur to fill them. The first example of a general reservation of such appointments was Clement IV's *Licet ecclesiarum*.<sup>8</sup> A right which the Papacy claimed as customary was that of electing the successor of any holder of a benefice who should die at the Apostolic See.<sup>9</sup> In *Licet*, Clement IV claimed to defend this traditional papal right when he reserved to himself appointments to all future vacancies of this type and declared null any appointment made by the ordinary patron in breach of the papal right. It seems clear that neither *Licet ecclesiarum* nor subsequent extensions of its reservation were meant to apply to bishoprics and higher Churches.<sup>10</sup>

Modern discussions of the system of papal reservations have tended to see *Licet ecclesiarum* as the starting point of a coherent development which made eventual papal control of ecclesiastical appointments almost unavoidable. They have also traced this development from *Licet* to John XXII's general reservations of episcopal and other appointments to the Apostolic See.<sup>11</sup> Canonists, both medieval and modern, have taken a more nuanced approach to this question. They have agreed that *Licet* made the general claim that the pope might dispose of all Churches. They have also pointed out, however, that, in fact, aside from making no specific claim to the disposition of episcopal Churches, *Licet* had also limited itself to the protection of rights which the Apostolic See regarded as traditional. These rights, whose exercise, with some justification, was thought to be essential to the support of fundamental curial functions, were being undermined by the wish of the ordinary patrons to preserve their own traditional rights of appointment.<sup>12</sup> Because of its

<sup>8</sup> *Liber Sextus* (= VI) 3.4.2.

<sup>9</sup> This right had been claimed as early as the pontificate of Innocent III; see X 3.5.26.

<sup>10</sup> Ganzer, *Papsttum und Bistumsbesetzungen*, p. 34 and n. 25, where the opinions of Johannes Andreae and Johannes Monachus about the limited application of *Licet ecclesiarum* are reported; the latter pointed out that it was exactly because *Licet* did not apply to bishoprics that the Curia was in the habit of publishing specific reservations when it wanted the opportunity to fill certain Sees. For a discussion of papal decretals that expanded or modified *Licet*, see J. R. Wright, *The Church and the English Crown 1305-1334. A Study Based on the Register of Archbishop Walter Reynolds* (Studies and Texts 48; Toronto, 1980), pp. 6-11.

<sup>11</sup> Wright, *ibid.*, pp. 6-11; Caillet, *La papauté d'Avignon*, pp. 22-23, 189, 463; F. Rapp, *L'Église et la vie religieuse en Occident à la fin du Moyen Âge* (Paris, 1971), p. 47.

<sup>12</sup> Guillelmus Duranti, in his commentary on the constitutions of the Council of Lyons II, explained the origin of *Licet* in the following terms (cited from *In sacrosanctum Lugdun. conc. sub Greg. X. Guillelmi Duranti cognomento Speculatoris Commentarius*, ed. S. Maido [Fano, 1569], fol. 74r): '... et nota quod ante constitutionem Clementis praelati habebant suos procuratores in curia qui, quam cito contigebat vacare aliquod beneficium ad eorum collationem spectans, illud conferebant et saepe Dominum Papam in conferendo praeveniebant et sibi illudebant, propter quod ipse Dominus Clemens motus fuit ad promulgandum constitutionem illam, *Licet*.' For a discussion of this commentary, see L. E. Boyle, 'The Date of the Commentary of William Duranti on the Constitutions

limited and understandable intent, *Licet* was seen by later canonists as the 'least odious' of papal reservations.<sup>13</sup> The eventual development of general reservations, in this view, did not flow directly from the substance of *Licet*, but required the intermediate step of academic elaboration of Clement IV's *obiter dictum* to the effect that the pope could freely dispose of all benefices.<sup>14</sup> After this view had become current among academics, it became possible for John XXII to make a fundamental innovation by reserving to himself the election of bishops in entire geographical areas without alleging any impossibility or abuse of the exercise of the rights of the ordinary electors. The very first such reservation, published on 13 September 1319, affected all Churches, even the archiepiscopal and episcopal ones, within the lands of the Roman Church.<sup>15</sup>

These theoretical developments in regard to postulations and reservations, in a certain sense, had been rendered necessary by the fact that popes like Innocent IV had acted as if they already had the power to appoint bishops. Especially in the exercise of rights of confirmation in Italian dioceses which, like Perugia, were directly subject to them, Innocent and his successors had often refused to confirm candidates presented by the chapters. Instead of requiring new elections, if a defect was alleged in the candidates presented by the chapters, these popes had blithely proceeded to choose men whom they found to be trustworthy, or who deserved rewards for services rendered, or who could be of valid assistance in the struggle against Frederick II and his successors, or who might in other ways contribute to the realization of the ends of papal policy.<sup>16</sup>

of the Second Council of Lyons', *Bulletin of Medieval Canon Law*, N. S. 4 (1974) 39-47 (reprinted in his *Pastoral Care, Clerical Education and Canon Law 1200-1400* [London, 1981], XII).

<sup>13</sup> Z. B. van Espen, *Jus ecclesiasticum universum*... 3 (Louvain, 1766), p. 114; see also p. 130, for the strong assertion that reservations are odious because they are contrary to the ancient canons and, indeed, to the modern ones as well because they are not 'clausae in Corpore Juris'; according to this view, papal reservations, from the time of John XXII into the modern age, have been applied merely by administrative fiat.

<sup>14</sup> *ibid.*, p. 126: 'Posito autem hoc principio, et in Scholis a plerisque Canonistis, praesertim post vulgatum sextum librum Decretalium, et librum Clementinarum, probato, nemini mirum videri debet, et jus Praeventiois subsequentes sibi vindicare Romanos Pontifices, ac tandem omnium pene Beneficiorum, ac Dignitatum Provisionem Sedi Apostolicae reservasse.' Fourteenth-century canonists had indeed argued that the popes had always had the power to confer bishoprics, and that they had graciously allowed to cathedral canons the right to elect; this is the view expounded in the *glossa ordinaria ad VI* 1.6.18, s. v. 'Devolvetur', cited here from *Sextus Decretalium a Bonifacio octavo in Concilio Lugdunensi editus, cum Epitomis, Divisionibus, et Glossa ordinaria Io. Andreae* ... (Venice, 1572), p. 78: 'Vt igitur huius iuris originalem scias, veritatem scire debes, scilicet de antiquo iure et dispositione ecclesie potestates conferendi episcopatus ad papam pertinere ... conferendi autem inferiores ecclesias ad episcopos. Sed haec regula fallit in casibus qui postmodum a iure fuerunt expressi. Voluerunt enim iura quod in cathedralibus sibi eligerent canonici ....'

<sup>15</sup> C. Lux, *Constitutionum apostolicarum de generali beneficiorum reservatione ab a. 1265 usque ad a. 1378 emissarum, tam intra quam extra Corpus Juris existentium, collectio et interpretatio* (Bratislava, 1904), pp. 28, 31-32.

<sup>16</sup> For an assessment of Innocent IV's policy in regard to episcopal designations, see Ganzer,

Other factors which might affect papal intervention in an election were of a fiscal nature. Already in the middle of the thirteenth century, each prelate in whose election the pontiff had played a role was required to pay to the Curia the *servitia communia*, amounting roughly to one third of the estimated yearly income of the benefice, and the related *servitia minuta*. Because they attached to the benefice and not to the person of the officeholder, these services alone could leave dioceses in debt for years in those cases of frequent transfers of bishops which became common with papal intervention in episcopal elections. Moreover, the popes eventually required also the payment of annates, or the first year's income of benefices received by papal intervention, and the *jus spoli*, or right to seizure of the property of deceased prelates whom they had appointed. The popes also claimed fruits during vacancies, that is, the income of vacant benefices whose last holder had been appointed by papal action; the amount of this latter right would increase with the duration of vacancies, so that there should be no surprise if vacancies under papal aegis tended to lengthen beyond the three months foreseen as the maximum by classic canon law.<sup>17</sup>

These were the principles of the system. To state them is to see that they could be easily abused because, in theory, they placed all power to elect bishops, and to appoint to other benefices, in the hands of an authority from which no appeal lay; this same authority, in turn, stood to gain much, financially and in other ways, from a stringent exercise of its new-found role as dispenser of all graces. It is sometimes asserted that the fears and accusations which contemporaries of the evolving system expressed about possibilities and cases of curial abuse were not justified because the development of papal control over these matters took place entirely within the bounds of the law. To take such a view, however, is to engage in a kind of naive positivism; moreover, such an approach helps not a bit in understanding why papal involvement in the process should have proven as acceptable as it did, or why it should have met what criticism it did encounter.<sup>18</sup> Much more interesting

*Papsttum und Bistumsbesetzungen*, pp. 137-224 and R. Brentano, *Two Churches. England and Italy in the Thirteenth Century* (Princeton, 1968), p. 213.

<sup>17</sup> For discussions of these various headings under which income accrued to the Papacy from episcopal appointments, see G. Mollat, *Lettres communes de Jean xxii. (1316-1334). Introduction: la collation des bénéfices ecclésiastiques à l'époque des papes d'Avignon (1305-1378)* (Paris, 1921), pp. 83 ff.; W. E. Lunt, *Papal Revenues in the Middle Ages*, 2 vols. (Records of Civilization: Sources and Studies 19; New York, 1934), 1.81-91, 93-107; Mollat, *Les papes d'Avignon*, pp. 504-12; Caillet, *La papauté d'Avignon*, pp. 25-27. For the extent to which this extreme fiscalization of appointments to ecclesiastical offices was rendered necessary by the Papacy's unremitting quest for excessive security in the papal lands, see P. Partner, *The Lands of St. Peter. The Papal State in the Middle Ages and the Early Renaissance* (London, 1972), pp. 263-64, 268, 280, 287-90, 292, 326. The limitation period of three months before the right to elect would be lost for the occasion was fixed by a canon of Lateran IV which was received as X 1.6.40.

<sup>18</sup> The positivist argument is made in exceedingly strong terms by Caillet, *La papauté d'Avignon*, pp. 52, 189. The argument entirely ignores the fact that the pope, by making laws which greatly

seems the question of the way in which the papal designation of bishops was coherent with the Papacy's relationship with a specific society, or of the way in which such designation affected relationships within the local Church and of that Church with the society of which it was a part. The state of the available sources may not always allow us to understand these aspects as fully as we would like, but there can be little doubt that a fuller appreciation of the motives and effectiveness of papal intervention in episcopal designation, and a more rounded understanding of the effect of this intervention, can only be obtained from the examination of specific cases.<sup>19</sup> This type of analysis is of particular value for Italy because that was the country which attracted the greatest number of papal interventions in episcopal elections and in appointments to major benefices generally.<sup>20</sup> Within Italy, papal attention was even more intensely focussed on events and possibilities within the lands of the Church; for this reason, the examination of the operation of the principles which have been outlined earlier in the case of the elections of the bishops of Perugia which took place between 1248 and 1352 seems particularly worthy of pursuit.

The history of most Italian dioceses, especially for the later Middle Ages, is still to be written. Perugia, despite a vigorous tradition of local historiography, is as badly served in this regard as the vast majority of the local Churches of Italy. It would be beyond our scope to make any attempt to fill this lack. A fuller exploration of many of the themes addressed here will have to await the systematic exploration on the part of local historians of the rich Perugian archives from the perspective of ecclesiastical history. The examination of the effects of papal intervention in episcopal elections upon the religious life — both devotional and

increased his own income and prerogatives at the expense of those of others, was acting as a judge in his own cause and, in the trenchant observation of an impassioned critic: '... non resta agl'altri, cosi principi come privati, salvo che l'obedienza. Bisognà dirli quello di Tacito: "Tibi summum suum arbitrium dii dedere, nobis obsequii gloria relictæ est (*Annales*, vi, viii, 7)." Egli averà potestà di fare tutte le legi che le parerà, tutte saranno valide, egli non sarà regolato da lege alcuna. Quando arrà controversia con alcuno farà una lege per la sua opinione, ecco tutto deciso' (P. Sarpi, 'Consiglio per rimediare alle offese fatte dal Pontefice col monitorio suo' in *Opere*, ed. G. and L. Cozzi [Storici, politici e moralisti del Seicento 1; Milan-Naples, 1969], pp. 137-38).

<sup>19</sup> For similar conclusions, see Barraclough, *Papal Provisions*, pp. 66-67 and G. Fransen, 'Papes, conciles, évêques du xii<sup>e</sup> au xv<sup>e</sup> siècle' in *Problemi di storia della Chiesa*, p. 19.

<sup>20</sup> Caillet, *La papauté d'Avignon*, pp. 35-36; B. Guillemin, 'Les papes d'Avignon et la cura animarum en Italie' in *Pievi e parrocchie in Italia nel basso Medioevo (sec. XIII-XV) (Atti del VI Convegno di storia della Chiesa in Italia, Firenze 21-25 settembre 1981)* (Italia sacra 35-36; Rome, 1984), pp. 197-214. This kind of diocese-by-diocese study is rare for Italy; two examples are A. Vasina, 'L'elezione degli arcivescovi ravennati del sec. XIII nei rapporti con la Santa Sede', *Rivista di storia della Chiesa in Italia* 10 (1956) 49-89 and G. Silano, 'Episcopal Elections and the Apostolic See. The Case of Aquileia: 1251-1420' in *Diritto e potere nella storia europea (Atti del Quarto Congresso internazionale della Società Italiana di Storia del Diritto, in onore di Bruno Paradisi)* (Florence, 1982), pp. 163-94.



institutional — of Perugia will only be possible after such an historiographical development. Our limited aim here shall be the examination, on the basis of the published sources, of the manner in which sweeping papal claims to the right to appoint bishops were affected, in practice, by the requirements of the broader relationship between the Papacy and the society of which bishops were pre-eminent members.

In Perugia, as in many another Italian city, the figure, if not always the person, of the bishop was important for the city's self-definition. Although there are few indications that the bishop of Perugia ever held civic powers of the sort that had devolved upon the bishops of many North Italian bishops, and even upon some Umbrian ones, the history of the city was nevertheless deeply identified with that of its bishops.<sup>21</sup> The most important feast in the Perugian calendar was that of Herculanus II, the bishop of the city who had led Perugian resistance against the siege of Totila and, in 548, was killed by the Goths in punishment for his role. It was on this feast, on 1 March, that towns which became subject to the city in the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth centuries were bound to bring marks of their subjection to Perugia. Moreover, Herculanus II, although preeminent, shared the role of patron of the city with another of its bishops, Constantius.<sup>22</sup>

Another sign of the enduring identification of the city with its bishop is to be found in the submission of Città della Pieve to Perugia on 3 December 1188. In the document which outlined the conditions of submission, the agents of the subject town promised that they would obey the mandates of the consuls of Perugia

<sup>21</sup> A very good introduction to the important and vexed question of the temporal powers of the bishops in Italy is to be found in the collection of papers edited by C. G. Mor and H. Schmidinger, *I poteri temporali dei vescovi in Italia e in Germania nel Medioevo* (Annali dell'Istituto storico italo-germanico, Quaderno 3; Bologna, 1979). The classic study of the same question in specific relation to Umbria is S. Mochi Onory, *Ricerche sui poteri civili dei vescovi nelle città umbre durante l'alto Medio Evo* (Biblioteca della Rivista di storia del diritto italiano 2; Rome, 1930). On the importance of the bishop for the self-definition of Italian cities, see O. Capitani, 'Città e comuni' in *Storia d'Italia* 4: *Comuni e signorie: istituzioni, società e lotte per l'egemonia*, ed. G. Galasso (Turin, 1981), pp. 14-21. English and North American historians have preferred to stress the poverty and small size of Italian dioceses as factors which minimized the importance and prestige of bishops in Italy: Brentano, *Two Churches*, pp. 62-63 (but see also pp. 218-19 for emphasis on the connectedness to place of Italian bishops); J. Larner, *Italy in the Age of Dante and Petrarch 1216-1380* (London-New York, 1980), p. 243.

<sup>22</sup> On the episcopal heavenly patrons of Perugia and the importance of their cult in civic life, see W. Heywood, *A History of Perugia* (London, 1910), pp. 16-22; Heywood is tempted to give some credence to Franco Sacchetti's statement (*Nov.* 169, reported *ibid.*, p. 22) that, 'I Perugini credono più in santo Ercolano che in Cristo; e tengono sia innanzi al maggiore santo in Paradiso.' For some early examples of submissions by other towns to Perugia which promise dues on the feast of St. Herculanus, see A. Bartoli Langelì, ed., *Codice diplomatico del comune di Perugia. Periodo consolare e podestarile (1139-1254). I. 1139-1237* (Fonti per la storia dell'Umbria 15; Perugia, 1983), pp. 32, 77.

or, if there should be no consuls, of the bishop of Perugia, or of the archpriest of the cathedral, or of two *boni homines* for each of the gates of Perugia.<sup>23</sup> This same document may also be taken as evidence that, in Perugia as in many another Italian city, the new prominence which the cathedral clergy had achieved in the election of the bishop — an election which now frequently designated a member of the cathedral chapter itself — had rendered places in the chapter desirable to members of the prominent families of the city. The submission of Città della Pieve seems to attest to a substantial congruence of the interests of the ruling families of Perugia with those of the bishop and chapter, the archpriest being the presiding officer of the latter. This may well argue for the existence in Perugia of a mechanism of apportionment of cathedral canonries among the prominent families of the city.<sup>24</sup> This sort of delicate mechanism, which tended to ensure smooth relations between bishop and chapter and the secular authorities, could easily break down when other considerations led to the designation of a bishop from outside the arrangement.

A further and final confirmation of Perugia's identification with its Church is to be found in the normal identification of the boundaries of its *contado* with those of the diocese over which its bishop ruled.<sup>25</sup> To be sure, this sort of identification was not peculiar to Perugia and was, to some extent, a means to an end; in Perugia as elsewhere, it amounted to a claim to the commune's right to dominate, in the temporal sphere, the whole area which, in the spiritual sphere, was subject to the jurisdiction of the city's bishop. Perugia would doggedly pursue the realization of this right until, in the fourteenth century, the boundaries of the *contado* under its control corresponded with the boundaries of the diocese.<sup>26</sup>

If the city had sufficient reasons, both historical and contingent, to be interested in the choice of its bishop, the popes had no less of an interest in the matter because of the pivotal importance of Perugia to the success of their policies in the lands of St. Peter. When Bologna had not yet been joined to the papal dominions, Perugia was second after Rome in population and wealth among the cities claimed by the popes.<sup>27</sup> Over and over, it was to prove a good deal more hospitable than

<sup>23</sup> Bartoli Langeli, *ibid.*, p. 25: '... et si non esset consulatus in prefata civitate quicquid episcopus Perusinus sive archipresbiter Sancti Laurentii vel duo boni homines per portam Perusine civitatis voluerint precipere predicto comiti aut eius heredibus, ipsi sine omni dolo et fraude facere et observare debent ....' This text has sometimes been used to raise the possibility that the bishop of Perugia may have enjoyed, at some unspecified time, temporal power in the city (Heywood, *ibid.*, pp. 25-26; Mochi Onory, *Ricerche sui poteri civili dei vescovi*, p. 194).

<sup>24</sup> For the important role which places in the cathedral chapter acquired in the political and patrimonial strategies of urban leading families in Italy, see G. Sergi, 'Vescovi, monasteri, aristocrazia militare' in *La Chiesa e il potere politico*, pp. 75-98, especially pp. 92-93, 97 and Ronzani, 'Vescovi, capitoli e strategie familiari nell'Italia comunale', *ibid.*, pp. 101-46.

<sup>25</sup> Bartoli Langeli, *Codice diplomatico*, pp. 43-44, 67-70.

<sup>26</sup> Heywood, *A History of Perugia*, p. 26.

<sup>27</sup> D. Waley, *The Papal State in the Thirteenth Century* (London-New York, 1961), pp. 85-86.

Rome as a residence for the wandering bishops of Rome and for the conclaves gathered to elect them.<sup>28</sup>

The relative strength of Perugia within the papal dominions, and the relative ineffectualness of the popes as temporal rulers, made the relationship between city and popes an ambiguous one; any advantage that might accrue to the Papacy from the appointment of Perugian bishops faithful to itself had to be balanced against the danger of the alienation of the affections of a city which raised to the level of an art the reconciliation of loyalty to the Apostolic See with its own expansionary policies in Umbria.<sup>29</sup>

The ambiguity of the relationship between the Papacy and Perugia had been already evident in the very act of submission of the commune to Innocent III, in the fall of 1198. While the city recognized the overlordship of the pope, it received confirmation of its rights to name its own civic officials, and was granted recognition of its own judicial system, including even the rare right not to have the decisions of its courts appealed to tribunals other than its own.<sup>30</sup> After securing such a wide sphere of autonomy in its submission to the pope, Perugia proceeded, throughout the thirteenth and much of the fourteenth centuries, to pursue an unswervingly Guelph policy of loyalty to the popes, but in a manner which was more frequently that of an ally than that of a subject. The commune was happy to receive papal mediators for the resolution of the internal strife which at times afflicted it in the thirteenth century; it was also always ready to fight on the side of the popes, especially if it could, at the same time, expand the area under its control. At the same time, the city was not always ready to curtail its ambitions in order to pursue merely papal aims; it could sometimes incur papal displeasure

<sup>28</sup> Balconeus Astur, *I Baglioni* (Prato, 1964), pp. 14-15 n. 5, lists the following popes as having died at Perugia in our period: Innocent III (1216), Urban IV (1264), Martin IV (1285), Benedict XI (1304); he also lists the following as having been elected by conclaves held there: Honorius III (1216), Clement IV (1265), Honorius IV (1285), Celestine V (1294), and Clement V (1305). The effect on the local ecclesial life of the protracted residence of the papal Curia in cities like Perugia has not yet been investigated.

<sup>29</sup> On the ambiguous relationship between the Papacy and Perugia and on the relative weakness of the popes before Perugian autonomist tendencies, see: Heywood, *A History of Perugia*, pp. vii, ix, 78-81, 93-94; Waley, *The Papal State in the Thirteenth Century*, pp. 37, 60, 64, 70, 85-86, 181-82, 215-16, 242-43, 249, 283-84; Partner, *The Lands of St. Peter*, pp. 233, 240, 242, 248-50, 252-53, 262; D. Segoloni, 'Bartolo da Sassoferrato e la civitas perusina' in *Bartolo da Sassoferrato. Studi e documenti per il VI centenario* 2 (Milan, 1962), pp. 514-671; M. Pecugi Fop, *Il comune di Perugia e la Chiesa durante il periodo avignonese con particolare riferimento all'Albornoz* (Deputazione di storia patria per l'Umbria, Appendici al *Bollettino* 2; Perugia, 1970).

<sup>30</sup> The liberal conditions of submission of Perugia to the Papacy are outlined in Innocent III's letter receiving the city under his protection; the letter may be read in: O. Hageneder and A. Heidacher, eds., *Die Register Innocenz' III.*, vol. 1: *I. Pontifikatsjahr, 1198-99. Texte* (Graz-Cologne, 1964), pp. 568-69; Segoloni, *ibid.*, 579; Bartoli Langelì, *Codice diplomatico*, pp. 47-48. For a discussion of the import of the letter for Perugia's autonomy, see: Segoloni, *ibid.*, pp. 579 ff.; Waley, *ibid.*, p. 37; Pecugi Fop, *ibid.*, pp. 7-11.

for its dogged refusal to obey papal mandates forbidding war with neighbours which it meant to subject to itself.<sup>31</sup> An examination of the elections of the bishops of Perugia in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries needs to be attuned to the state of relations between Papacy and commune at the time of each election.

In 1248, the See of Perugia was vacant by the death of Salvius, who had held the See since 1231 and had been a loyal servant of the Apostolic See; he had been papal legate to the Bulgarians and Wallachians and may have died in France after following Innocent IV in his Lyonese exile.<sup>32</sup> The vacancy, which may have occurred as early as 1244, had come at a time of strain and stress for Perugia. From 1240 and almost single-handedly, the city had led the resistance to Frederick II in Umbria. The anti-imperial effort, which was to last until the end of 1247, had required all the city's resources and had exacerbated the divisions and factionalism which were endemic to Italian urban life of the period. Signs of difficulties had also appeared in the relations between the Perugian secular and spiritual powers; the magistrates and commune had incurred excommunication for passing a statute which breached ecclesiastical liberties. The statute attempted to impose on the clergy some taxes and collections which may have been meant to assist with the commune's war effort.<sup>33</sup>

At the beginning of 1248, when the imperial forces had withdrawn from Umbria and a certain measure of order had been reestablished in Perugia, the chapter met and elected Benauditus. The bishop-elect was a Perugian citizen who, before his election to the bishopric of Chiusi, in 1237, had been archdeacon of Perugia and a member of the chapter.<sup>34</sup> Because the candidate was already a bishop, in full accordance with the rules we have outlined, the chapter presented a request to Innocent IV that he dissolve the bond between Benauditus and the Church of Chiusi in order to enable him to marry that of Perugia. Innocent, from Lyons, on 11 May 1248, accepted the unanimous request of the chapter and transferred

<sup>31</sup> Mediation of internal discord was, for Perugia, one of the boons of submission to the Papacy (Waley, *ibid.*, pp. 64, 70, 85; Partner, *The Lands of St. Peter*, p. 242; Segoloni, 'Bartolo da Sassoferrato', 611-12). For the documentary evidence of the peace-making efforts of papal envoys in Perugia, see Bartoli Langeli, *ibid.*, pp. 133-36, 177-79, 188-89. For evidence and discussions of the ambiguity of the relationship between the Papacy and Perugia, see n. 29 above.

<sup>32</sup> For the appointment of Salvius as papal envoy, see L. Auvray et al., eds., *Les registres de Grégoire IX* (Paris, 1890-1955), nos. 3694-95, 3716-20. There had been much uncertainty and confusion in Perugian historiography as to the succession to Salvius; this confusion is reflected in the list compiled by C. Eubel, *Hierarchia catholica Medii Aevi*, 2nd edition (Muenster, 1913), p. 396, tentatively postulating a succession from Salvius to Frigerius and then to Benauditus (Benenatus). Our discussion here follows the conclusions reached in the magisterial article by A. Bartoli Langeli, 'I vescovi di Perugia e di Chiusi durante il pontificato di Innocenzo IV', *Rivista di storia della Chiesa in Italia* 27 (1973) 1-27.

<sup>33</sup> Bartoli Langeli, *ibid.*, 14-16; Heywood, *A History of Perugia*, pp. 70-75; Waley, *The Papal State in the Thirteenth Century*, p. 149.

<sup>34</sup> Bartoli Langeli, *ibid.*, 9.

Benauditus from Chiusi to Perugia; on 26 May of the same year, the pope also granted to the new bishop of Perugia the authority to absolve its citizens from the penalties which they had incurred for their breach of ecclesiastical liberty.<sup>35</sup>

It has been compellingly suggested that, in choosing Benauditus as their candidate, the members of the chapter of Perugia knew very well that they were not merely electing a fellow citizen and former member of their body who was acceptable to themselves. The canons were proposing to Innocent one whom he had already had good reason to regard as a willing tool of his policies in Umbria. The city of Chiusi, which had traditionally been in the imperial camp during the difficulties between Papacy and Empire, was one in which the bishop enjoyed civil authority. It appears that Benauditus may have been imposed on Chiusi as its bishop by Innocent during a brief spell, in 1243, in which the Guelph side had gained predominance in that city. In accordance with the interests of the Papacy and of his own native city, Benauditus had exercised his civil powers in order to move Chiusi to the papal side in the struggle then being waged against Frederick II. The immediate result in Chiusi was the constitution of an autonomous political regime which abolished the secular power of the bishop and forced Benauditus out of Chiusi. The bishop, who may also have been named papal rector of the Duchy of Spoleto, appears to have taken up residence in Perugia. Thus, the chapter of Perugia, in meeting for the election, had at hand one of their own who was already a bishop, who had distinguished himself in the Guelph cause, of which Perugia was then the standard-bearer in Umbria, and who seemed certain to enjoy the favour of Innocent IV. The ready acceptance of the chapter's postulation, and the subsequent papal grant of authority to the bishop for the absolution of the magistrates and commune of Perugia, seemed to confirm that the chapter had indeed pleased the pope by the choice.<sup>36</sup>

The translation of Benauditus from Chiusi to Perugia is a very good example of the way in which traditional interests and evolving papal norms could be reconciled in the election of bishops. If both the ordinary electors and the pope were willing to consider each other's requirements, there was no need for clashes, and papal intervention could take place entirely within the compass of the norms.

Benauditus did not hold the See of Perugia for more than a few years, nor was his tenure entirely free of further clashes with secular authorities. On 19 January 1251, Innocent IV again authorized the bishop to absolve the officers of the commune from an excommunication which they had incurred for renewed attempts to extort pecuniary contributions from the clergy. The pope also encouraged the bishop to extend subventions to the commune, which seems to have continued to enjoy papal favour in the next few years; in 1252, it received a papal

<sup>35</sup> É. Berger, ed., *Les registres d'Innocent IV* (Paris, 1884-1919), nos. 4022-24.

<sup>36</sup> Bartoli Langelì, 'I vescovi di Perugia e di Chiusi', 22-25.

confirmation of the privilege not to have appeals heard outside the city.<sup>37</sup> If such favours were meant to ensure continued Perugian support of papal aims in the wake of Frederick II's death, they succeeded.

Benauditus died in the course of 1253 and was followed in the See by Frigerius, who died within a few months and for the process of whose election no evidence appears to be extant.<sup>38</sup> In the subsequent election, the chapter again requested that the pope approve their choice of a bishop of Chiusi, Petrus, as bishop of Perugia. The chapter's request was rejected by Innocent IV, on or before 31 October 1254; the pope named master Bernardus, papal chaplain and canon of Assisi, as bishop of Perugia.<sup>39</sup> Alexander IV, in a letter from Naples dated almost immediately after his own election, wrote to the archpriest and chapter of Perugia in order to notify them of the fact that he had personally consecrated Bernardus as bishop of Perugia; under penalty of excommunication, the members of the chapter were enjoined to accept Bernardus as their bishop and to exhibit due obedience to him.<sup>40</sup>

The appointment of Bernardus by Innocent IV took place at a relatively peaceful time in Italy; Manfred had not yet begun his own offensive against the Guelphs and the latter seemed triumphant everywhere. In such a situation, Innocent appears to have felt free to engage in an act of pure patronage toward one of his own and not to have been overly concerned with the respect of local sensibilities.<sup>41</sup> Alexander IV's ready adoption of his predecessor's choice and his personal consecration of him may argue for merits in Bernardus that justified the choice; the threats of censures which the pope addressed to the chapter may indicate that he did not necessarily expect them to see those same merits as clearly as he did. In any case,

<sup>37</sup> *Les registres d'Innocent IV*, nos. 5006, 6001; A. Bartoli Langeli, ed., *Codice diplomatico del comune di Perugia. Periodo consolare e podestarile (1139-1254). II. (1237-1254)* (Fonti per la storia dell'Umbria 17; Perugia, 1985), p. 519; Waley, *The Papal State in the Thirteenth Century*, p. 156. Partner, *The Lands of St. Peter*, p. 258, construes Innocent's encouragement to the bishop to extend subventions to the commune as a permission to tax the clergy; he sees in this a sign of Innocent's weakness rather than of his gratitude.

<sup>38</sup> Bartoli Langeli, 'I vescovi di Perugia e di Chiusi', 9.

<sup>39</sup> *Les registres d'Innocent IV*, no. 8108; the letter, addressed to the bishop of Spoleto, asserts that Innocent had earlier given a mandate to the same bishop for the installation of master Bernardus as bishop of Perugia. The execution of that mandate had been suspended while the pope considered the request presented by the chapter. Because that request has now been rejected, the addressee is commanded to proceed with the execution of the previous, unfortunately unregistered, mandate.

<sup>40</sup> C. de La Roncière, J. de Loye, A. Coulon, and P. de Cénival, eds., *Les registres d'Alexandre IV* (Paris, 1884-1921), no. 15 (31 December 1254).

<sup>41</sup> Master Bernardus appears to be the same canon of Assisi on whose behalf, on 20 November 1252, Innocent had written to the rector of the March of Ancona with the mandate, 'quatinus [ei] de aliqua episcopali dignitate, vel beneficio ecclesiastico quod recipientem deceat et donantem, provideas auctoritate nostra quamcito ad hoc habueris in Anconitana Marchia facultatem' (*Les registres d'Innocent IV*, no. 6780). This mandate appears to fortify the opinion expressed by Bartoli Langeli, 'I vescovi di Perugia e di Chiusi', 26 n. 90, that, in the bestowal of the See of Perugia upon Bernardus, we are indeed faced with a simple act of patronage.

the fact that no defect is imputed to the chapter's candidate makes clear that the popes, in the formal respect of their own prerogative in cases of postulation, feel free to disregard local choices in order to intrude their own trusted men in the episcopacy.

Bernardus must have been a relatively young man when elected because he held the See for more than thirty years; he died on 26 August 1287.<sup>42</sup> The years of his episcopacy were those of the final defeat of the Hohenstaufens, a defeat in which Perugia was a full participant. In that period, the city, free from obligations in the wider arena, had turned to the dogged pursuit of the expansion of its domains and to new attempts to curtail ecclesiastical liberties, despite papal displeasure at these developments.<sup>43</sup> In the early 1280s, Perugia engaged in war against Foligno; when the pope forbade it to continue in the assault, subjected it to interdict, and prohibited the nomination of its citizens to offices in the papal lands, the city responded by burning pope and cardinals in effigy.<sup>44</sup> Although Perugia ceased its fighting against Foligno in the summer of 1283 and appears to have paid a fine in the order of 40,000 florins or more, it was again defying the orders of papal officers in 1286 and 1287 and, in the spring of the next year, was again engaged in its war against Foligno.<sup>45</sup>

At a time when Perugia could not be said to be enjoying papal favour, the chapter of Perugia, having met to elect a successor to Bernardus, was not able to produce a unanimous choice. Some of the canons elected Libriacus, archpriest of the cathedral, and others chose Ranerius, abbot of the monastery of St. Peter of Perugia. According to Nicholas IV, the archpriest had at first consented to his own election and had sought confirmation from the Apostolic See; subsequently, for reasons which Nicholas does not disclose, Libriacus renounced his rights in the matter. As for the abbot, Nicholas states that he had not consented to his own

<sup>42</sup> Eubel, *Hierarchia catholica*, p. 396. An anonymous Perugian chronicle dates the death to 29 August (F. A. Ugolini, 'Annali e cronaca di Perugia in volgare dal 1191 al 1336', *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e filosofia dell'Università degli studi di Perugia* 1 [1963-64] 1-336 [reprinted separately under the same title at Perugia in 1964], p. 158).

<sup>43</sup> Heywood, *A History of Perugia*, pp. 76-80; Waley, *The Papal State in the Thirteenth Century*, pp. 162-63, 180. On the question of clerical privilege, Perugia stood accused of attempting to bring clerics before the communal courts, and of burdening the canons in particular through the seizure of their property and by the imposition of heavy taxes on them (P. Pellini, *Dell'istoria di Perugia*, part 1 [Venice, 1664; rpt. Bologna, 1968], p. 274; Heywood, *ibid.*, p. 79).

<sup>44</sup> Heywood, *ibid.*, p. 74; Waley, *ibid.*, p. 206; Partner, *The Lands of St. Peter*, p. 279.

<sup>45</sup> Waley, *ibid.*, pp. 206, 216. Waley (p. 206) notes that there was a fundamental divergence of views between the Papacy and Perugia as to what the import of the city's fighting with Foligno was; the Papacy saw rebellion at work, while Perugia, contemporaneously fighting Foligno and putting troops at the disposal of the pope for a campaign in Romagna, denied that it was rebellious merely because it fought a rival city. Waley (p. 267) also points out the noteworthiness of Perugia's ability to pay a fine of 40,000 florins; he calculates that the sum was probably equivalent to the yearly revenues of the whole of the March at the time.

election and had not sought its confirmation within the time defined by the law. By a letter of 17 April 1288, Nicholas announced that he had elected Johannes, archdeacon of Aquileia, subdeacon and papal chaplain, as bishop of Perugia.<sup>46</sup>

The new bishop belonged to an important family of the second rank in the Roman Campagna. He had become archdeacon of Aquileia while Gregorius de Montelongo, his uncle, was patriarch of that See. Gregorius, a relative of Innocent III, had been a leading champion of the struggle against Frederick II and of the Guelph cause generally for several decades.<sup>47</sup> By his appointment of Johannes, Nicholas IV was favouring the member of a family which had long proven loyal to papal aims and who could be expected, so far as it lay in his power, to assist such aims in Perugia. The appointment may also have been intended as a reward for a man already advanced in age who, at the time of his election, had been archdeacon of Aquileia for more than twenty years. Johannes would hold the See of Perugia for less than three years; he died on 9 November 1290.<sup>48</sup>

Throughout the years during which Johannes was its bishop, Perugia continued its war against Foligno and refused to obey the mandates of the pope forbidding

<sup>46</sup> É. Langlois, ed., *Les registres de Nicholas IV* (Paris, 1886-93), nos. 42-45; see also no. 63 (5 May 1288), by which the bishop-elect is authorized to receive the orders of deacon and priest, and episcopal consecration. As for Abbot Ranerius, who was a member of the Coppoli family, he must already have been rather aged at the time of his election; he had been abbot of St. Peter since 1255, when he had succeeded Abbot Jacobus, his uncle. Ranerius had been a vigorous abbot and had occasionally acted as papal judge delegate (C. Tabarelli, *Liber contractuum (1331-32) dell'Abbazia benedettina di San Pietro in Perugia* [Fonti per la storia dell'Umbria 3; Perugia, 1967], p. 459 n. 1). On the abbot's family, see A. Bartoli Langelì, 'La famiglia Coppoli nella società perugina del Duecento' in *Francescanesimo e società cittadina: l'esempio di Perugia* (Pubblicazioni del Centro per il collegamento degli studi medievali e umanistici nell'Università di Perugia 1; Perugia, 1979), pp. 45-112.

<sup>47</sup> G. Marchetti-Longhi, 'La famiglia di Gregorio da Monte Longo patriarca d'Aquileia', *Memorie storiche forogiuliesi* 19 (1923) 105-30 and 20 (1924) 91-122. Johannes appears to have been his uncle's favourite nephew; in the patriarch's will, aside from being named executor, Johannes was also designated as one of the principal beneficiaries (G. Marchetti-Longhi, *Registro degli atti e delle lettere di Gregorio di Montelongo (1233-1269)* [Rome, 1965], pp. 177-80). He appears as archdeacon of Aquileia as of 26 June 1260 and is rector of the Citramontanes at the University of Padua in 1271 (C. Scaloni, ed., *Necrologium aquileiense* [Fonti per la storia della Chiesa in Friuli 1; Udine, 1982], p. 271 n. 20).

<sup>48</sup> Ugolini, 'Annali e cronaca di Perugia', 160, s. a. 1290: 'In quisto millesimo, di viiii.º di novembre, posone de quista vita messer Gianni da Campagna, el quale era ovescovo di Peroscia.' See also Pellini, *Dell'istoria di Perugia*, p. 308, who, perhaps on the strength of the earlier chronicle, also identifies the bishop as 'Giovanni di Campagna'. The Campagna being the area of origin of the Montelongo family, it seems difficult to avoid the identification of Bishop Johannes with the member of that family who had been archdeacon of Aquileia. The editor of the *Necrologium aquileiense*, p. 271 n. 20, confuses our Johannes with another archdeacon of the same name, who is reported to have died on 6 August of an unspecified year. The last known act of Johannes in Aquileia was to sit as arbiter in a dispute between Raymundus de Lature, patriarch, and the chapter of Aquileia, on 12 March 1282; by 1 April of the same year, he appears at the papal Court in Orvieto (*Necrologium*, pp. 62-63 n. 32, 271 n. 20). Presumably, the archdeacon remained at the Court in his role as papal chaplain until he was named to Perugia.



such actions. Pope Nicholas continued to make his displeasure clear, but without effect on the Perugians.<sup>49</sup> The tension between the commune and the Church may explain the unusual provision made by the former during the mortal illness of Bishop Johannes. Two men for each of the gates of the city were appointed to take care of the bishop's possessions during his illness and the subsequent vacancy, until a successor should take possession of the See.<sup>50</sup> In this situation, the chapter of Perugia was careful to produce a unanimous result and again set its sights on Ranerius, the abbot of St. Peter, despite the fact that the abbot, apparently, had not been interested in the office at the previous election. According to Nicholas IV, Ranerius again refused to consent to his election and, for this reason, the pope had reserved the appointment of the bishop of Perugia to the Apostolic See. At the petition of the chapter and people of Perugia, the pope claimed, he elected as bishop Bulgarus de Montemelino, prior of the collegiate church of St. Johannes de Marsano, in the diocese of Perugia. The papal nominee was a member of a noble family of the Perugian *contado* which, a few years earlier, had been outlawed as supporters of the imperial side.<sup>51</sup>

There are grounds for holding in some suspicion the assertions of Nicholas IV in regard to the course of events which had led to his choice of Bulgarus. It is not clear in what sense the chapter could be said to have consummated its right to elect by its choice of Ranerius; if the abbot had indeed not consented to the election, then there had not yet been any election and there would have been no grounds

<sup>49</sup> Waley, *The Papal State in the Thirteenth Century*, p. 216; *Les registres de Nicholas IV*, nos. 7329-30; Segoloni, 'Bartolo da Sassoferrato', 624-25.

<sup>50</sup> Pellini, *Dell'istoria di Perugia*, p. 308, s. a. 1290, where it is reported that the councils of the commune discussed what ought to be done about the goods of the bishopric, '... e fosse deliberato, che s'eleggessero dieci uomini, due per ciascuna porta, che n'havessero a prender cura, che per man di Notaro pubblico n'havessero a fare inventario, e fedelmente custodirle infino a tanto che dalla città si fosse provveduto di nuovo vescovo.' Probably, excessive emphasis ought not to be placed on Pellini's use of the preposition 'dalla', which might seem to assert a requirement that the next bishop not be designated from outside the city. In any case, Bishop Johannes, who had protested this measure, was told that the property would be returned to him if he should regain his health; if recovery should not occur, the bishop was assured that it would be faithfully preserved for his successor. This was a provision, according to Pellini, *ibid.*, '... veramente degna della bontà di quei tempi, poscia che 'l Vescovo Giovanni morì l'istesso mese, nel cui tempo Papa Nicola III. levò l'interdetto ch'avea i mesi a dietro contro Perugini fulminato, e nel grembo di Santa Chiesa gli raccolse.' It is difficult to conclude, on the basis of Pellini's narrative, whether the commune's act was meant to put pressure on the chapter, which would normally have administered episcopal goods during a vacancy, or on the pope, in order to ensure that the successor to Johannes be a Perugian.

<sup>51</sup> *Les registres de Nicholas IV*, nos. 3936-39. The connection of Bulgarus with the Montemelino family is confirmed by a papal grace, *ibid.*, no. 5585 (7 July 1291): 'Raynaldo, clerico, nato nobilis viri Theverutii de Montemelino, Perusinae diocesis. Cum eo, consideratione .. episcopi Perusini, cuius est nepos, dispensat ut, non obstante defectu aetatis et sacrorum ordinum quem patitur, beneficium ecclesiasticum, etiamsi curam animarum habeat et dignitas vel personatus existat, recipere possit.' For the earlier difficult relations of the family of Montemelino with the commune of Perugia and the Papacy, see Heywood, *A History of Perugia*, pp. 74-75.

for the election to come to papal attention. The pope had to renew his appointment of Bulgarus to the Perugian See three months after his first decree of provision, and by a mandate in which he made clear that the abbot of St. Peter had in the meantime died. This may indicate that not all in Perugia were as certain as the pope that the abbot had been unwilling to take up the episcopal office, and that some resistance had developed to the intrusion of another papal candidate in the office.<sup>52</sup> In any case, obedience seems to have been extended to this second papal mandate; soon after its publication, Bulgarus was to be found embroiled in litigation with the commune of Perugia over its treatment of criminous clerics and with the monastery of St. Peter over its right of exemption from episcopal jurisdiction.<sup>53</sup>

Bulgarus remained in the See for eighteen years; he died on 23 November 1308.<sup>54</sup> His death coincided with the election of Henry VII to the Empire and the resurgence of the Ghibelline cause in Italy. The election of a new Perugian bishop was to take place in a political context in which the Guelph party, of which Perugia continued to be the standard-bearer in Umbria, was in a state of disarray, and with the involvement of a pope, Clement V, who, having announced his intention to remain in France, had shown relatively little interest in Italian affairs.<sup>55</sup>

The chapter of Perugia, for its part, quickly proceeded to an election which resulted in discord; candidates were Boninsegna, canon of Perugia, and Guido de Baysio, archdeacon of Bologna, famous canonist and *auditor litterarum contradictarum*. After Guido had refused his election and Boninsegna had accepted, the latter proceeded to seek confirmation at the Curia. After several years of hearings before Cardinal Peter Colonna, judge delegate in the matter, the pope refused to confirm Boninsegna's election to Perugia, but appointed him to the See of Ascoli.<sup>56</sup> This appointment makes clear that there was no question of Boninsegna's worthiness for the episcopate. Although we lack evidence for curial motives behind the rejection of Boninsegna for Perugia, it seems plausible to suggest that a desire to avoid dissension in the city may have been involved. Meanwhile, the delay in

<sup>52</sup> *Les registres de Nicholas IV*, no. 4736 (9 April 1291): in this letter, no mention appears to have been made of a papal reservation of the election; it specifies, however, that the chapter and people of Perugia had sent solemn ambassadors to request the appointment of Bulgarus.

<sup>53</sup> *ibid.*, no. 6371 (22 December 1291): at the instance of Bishop Bulgarus, the captain of Perugia is cited to appear before the Apostolic See for having prosecuted clerics who had engaged in violence. For the bishop's attempt to establish a claim to the right of confirmation of the abbot of St. Peter, see Tabarelli, *Liber contractuum*, p. 260 n. 1.

<sup>54</sup> Ugolini, 'Annali e cronaca di Perugia', 175.

<sup>55</sup> Partner, *The Lands of St. Peter*, pp. 293, 297-303.

<sup>56</sup> For the events of the election and subsequent adjudication, see the letter providing Franciscus to Perugia: *Regestum Clementis papae v ex vaticanis archetypis ...*, cura et studio monachorum O.S.B. (Rome, 1885-92), no. 8271 (8 May 1312); for the provision of Boninsegna to Ascoli, see nos. 8254 and 8274, by which the benefices which had become vacant by Boninsegna's promotion at the Apostolic See are conferred upon two Siennese clerics.

deciding the question of Boninsegna's election allowed the income from the vacant See to accrue to the Apostolic See; further income was generated for the Curia by the two Perugian benefices which became vacant by Boninsegna's appointment to Ascoli, and which were granted to others by Clement v because they were now vacant 'apud Apostolicam Sedem'.<sup>57</sup>

Franciscus Poggi, a Dominican from Lucca, was appointed to the See of Perugia on 8 May 1312.<sup>58</sup> Pellini, in his chronicle of Perugia, under the mistaken date of 1306, notes a protest addressed to the pope by the commune of Perugia about the fact that their bishop, Franciscus, had remained too long at the Curia; it seemed desirable to the petitioners that their shepherd should be busy feeding his sheep.<sup>59</sup> The bishop was certainly in Perugia in 1329, the last year of his life, when he quickly responded to the commune's attempt to tax the clergy by subjecting the city to an interdict; the commune, perhaps wishing it had not insisted on the residence of its shepherd, withdrew the offending measure on the same day on which the interdict was declared.<sup>60</sup>

During Franciscus' episcopacy, the relations of Perugia with the Papacy developed in such a way that the political context of the election of his successor was very different from that of Franciscus. John xxii had shown much more interest in Italian affairs than his predecessor, so much so that, by some calculations, he devoted as much as two thirds of the Papacy's income during his pontificate to the task of settling the Italian situation in ways acceptable to himself.<sup>61</sup> He had also had frequent occasion to invoke Perugian assistance for his often ineffectual officers in the papal lands. The commune of Perugia, while responding positively to almost all of John xxii's requests for aid, had also seized every chance to profit from the

<sup>57</sup> See the preceding note.

<sup>58</sup> See n. 56 above.

<sup>59</sup> Pellini, *Dell'istoria di Perugia*, pp. 351 (s. a. 1308) and 510 (s. a. 1330), went so far in his confusion about Bishop Franciscus that he reported his death twice. Nevertheless, there are grounds for believing that Franciscus, despite the long vacancy which his See had already endured, was in no particular hurry to go to Perugia; on 5 August 1312, he was granted a delay of six months before he must receive his episcopal consecration at the Curia (*Regestum Clementis papae v*, no. 8605). Franciscus is the first bishop of Perugia of whom we have certain notice that he bound himself to pay the common services due for his appointment at the Curia; he did so on 4 December 1312, when, presumably, he had just received his episcopal consecration (H. Hoberg, *Taxae pro communibus servitiis ex libris obligationum ab anno 1295 usque ad annum 1455 confectis* [Studi e testi 144; Vatican City, 1949], p. 94).

<sup>60</sup> Pellini, *ibid.*, pp. 508-509.

<sup>61</sup> For the changing policy of Avignonese popes in regard to Italy, see G. Tabacco, 'Programmi di politica italiana in età avignonese' in *Aspetti culturali della società italiana nel periodo del papato avignonese*, pp. 51-75; Tabacco (p. 63) characterizes John xxii's policy as one of 'exasperated Guelphism'. Partner, *The Lands of St. Peter*, p. 326, estimates that John xxii spent three million gold florins on Italian wars during his pontificate, and that this amounted to two thirds of the total income of the Papacy in that period.

endemic disorder which existed around itself, and had even more explicitly come to act as a papal ally rather than a subject.<sup>62</sup> It had not shied away from challenging the jurisdiction of papal officers not merely over itself, but even over communes such as Spoleto, which Perugia had submitted to itself while professing to fight against it on behalf of the pope. John XXII had usually met such situations with compromises which attempted to safeguard formal positions while granting to the Perugians much of the substance of what they wanted. Thus, when the Perugians seized the right to appoint the podestà of conquered Spoleto, the pope allowed them to exercise the right, but as delegates and at the pleasure of the Apostolic See.<sup>63</sup> A similar pattern was to be followed in the matter of the choice of a successor to Bishop Franciscus.

Earlier in his pontificate, John XXII had published a general reservation to the Apostolic See of the right of election of all bishops and other prelates within the papal dominions.<sup>64</sup> The chapter of Perugia, possibly in emulation of the successful tactics of its secular counterparts, decided to ignore the papal prohibition of capitular elections; its members met within a week of Franciscus' death and unanimously elected Hugolinus Guelfoni, abbot of St. Peter.<sup>65</sup> The possibility of exploiting papal intervention in elections to their own advantage appears not to have escaped some of the more ambitious families of Perugia. An anonymous Perugian chronicle asserts that, more than a week after the chapter's election of Hugolinus, Vinciolus de Vinciolis proposed in the communal council that the

<sup>62</sup> Heywood, *A History of Perugia*, pp. 113-50; Pecugi Fop, *Il comune di Perugia e la Chiesa*, pp. 14-23; Segoloni, 'Bartolo da Sassoferrato', 644-46.

<sup>63</sup> For the matter of Spoleto, see Heywood, *ibid.*, pp. 113-32 and Pecugi Fop, *ibid.*, pp. 17-21. Pecugi Fop (pp. 97-111) also publishes letters of John XXII requesting Perugian assistance in various instances and attempting to obtain the commune's obedience in the question of Spoleto.

<sup>64</sup> See n. 15 above.

<sup>65</sup> The bishop-elect has sometimes been confused with Hugolinus de Vibiis, his successor as abbot of St. Peter: see, e.g., Eubel, *Hierarchia catholica*, p. 396. The chronicle edited by Ugolini, 'Annali e cronaca di Perugia', 224, s. a. 1330, states: 'In quisto millesimo, a di xxiii. de novembre, e calonnacie de Sa Lorenzo alessoro per ovescovo de Peroscia meser Gulino d'Agobbio, el quale era abate de sam Pietro de Peroscia.' Pellini, *Dell'istoria di Perugia*, pp. 511-12, shows familiarity with the earlier chronicle and dissatisfaction with its identification of the bishop-elect as Hugolinus of Gubbio; he doubts that the canons of Perugia would have elected someone from Gubbio and identifies the new bishop as Hugolinus de Vibiis. His identification was followed by later historians. It is not clear why the earlier chronicle asserts a provenance from Gubbio for the bishop-elect. It is clear, however, that Hugolinus Guelfoni was elected and confirmed abbot of St. Peter in 1310. He was a well-known canonist who was charged with many judicial and administrative duties by the Papacy and, having been elected bishop of Perugia, was consecrated on 19 May 1331 by the bishops of Orvieto, Gubbio, and Todi (Tabarelli, *Liber contractuum*, pp. 11-13 n. 2). Hugolinus de Vibiis was elected abbot of St. Peter in the vacancy created by the episcopal election of his predecessor and was confirmed by John XXII on 27 February 1331. He also was a canonist who commissioned copies of legal works, allowed his monks to attend the University, and received numerous papal commissions; the probable year of his death was 1362 (*ibid.*, pp. 26-27 n. 1).

authorities of the commune seal letters which he had addressed to the pope. The letters requested the nomination of Alexander de Vincioliis, knight of St. John and Perugian ambassador to Avignon, as the new bishop of Perugia. Pellini, who receives the older chronicle, adds a suggestion that the nominator was the father of the nominee. In any case, this proposal served to focus the rivalry between the Oddi and Baglioni families, whose feuds would then go on to last for centuries. Balionus Novellus Gualfredutii de Balionibus supported the instances of Vincioliis while Odo Ungari spoke vehemently against the proposal. A popular revolution seemed about to break on the issue and the decisive intervention of the captain and the podestà was required in order to calm the situation. Vincioliis and Odo were both sent into exile because of the dispute.<sup>66</sup> Apparently as a consequence of the same dispute, Odo was eventually murdered, on 1 December 1331, by the brothers Uccioliis and Philipputus Gualfredutii de Balionibus and by Cecchinus de Vincioliis. The murderers only saved themselves from the popular indignation that the deed aroused by claiming sanctuary in the convent of St. Dominic. They were then banished from the city and their exile lasted more than twenty years.<sup>67</sup>

John xxii, on 11 January 1331, issued a letter by which he named Hugolinus to the See of Perugia; the pope professed to make the appointment on the strength of a general reservation of episcopal elections to the Apostolic See.<sup>68</sup> In the letter, John appears to have made no mention whatsoever of the fact that the chapter of Perugia had purported to engage in a canonical election of Hugolinus. By this omission, the pope preserved the principle that papal mandates were not to be without effect and, at the same time, left Hugolinus to bear the fiscal obligations which followed from papal nomination to such an office.<sup>69</sup>

Several considerations may have moved the pope to accept the candidate designated by the chapter. In the first place, John may have thought that the election of anyone else to the See was certain to lead to a recrudescence of the disputes which had already threatened to lead to civil war, or at least to great disorder, in a city which occupied an important place in John's policy to bring about order in the lands of the Church. In the second place, the pope may very

<sup>66</sup> Ugolini, *ibid.*, 224-25; Pellini, *ibid.*, pp. 511-12. The episode is discussed by Heywood, *A History of Perugia*, pp. 156-57; Baleoneus Astur, *I Baglioni*, p. 37; Tabarelli, *ibid.*, pp. 43-44 n. 2.

<sup>67</sup> Tabarelli, *ibid.*, pp. 43-44 n. 2, specifies that Uccioliis was a monk of St. Peter and prior of the church of St. Maria de Fonte, and that, although Benedict xii, on 11 June 1336, charged the bishop to have the podestà and captain of Perugia revoke the sentence of exile against the perpetrators, the ban seems to have lasted into the 1350s.

<sup>68</sup> G. Mollat, ed., *Jean xxii (1316-1334). Lettres communes analysées d'après les registres dits d'Avignon et du Vatican* (Paris, 1904-1959), no. 52308: 'Hugolinus, abbas monast. S. Petri Perusini, O.S.B., fit ep.us eccl. Perusinae, vacantis per obitum Francisci et generaliter reservatae'.

<sup>69</sup> Bishop Hugolinus, on 19 March 1331, bound himself to pay the sum of 600 florins for the services due (Hoberg, *Taxae pro communibus servitiis*, p. 94).

well have been swayed by the qualities of the candidate which had moved John himself, in the course of several years, to appoint him to many responsible functions on behalf of the Curia. Both the qualities of the candidate and the necessity to unite behind the choice of the chapter in order to quell any further disturbance appear to have moved the commune to organize particularly joyful festivities for the entrance of the bishop into the city, and to present him with the gift of a silver cup containing 200 florins.<sup>70</sup>

The next vacancy of the Perugian See, which occurred with the death of Hugolinus, on 7 October 1337, again found Perugia in a position of strength in its relations with the Papacy.<sup>71</sup> Benedict XII had retained his predecessor's interest in Italian affairs, but felt a certain distaste for John XXII's profligate commitment to the aim of establishing effective papal control over the lands of St. Peter.<sup>72</sup> The reconciliation of economy with the wish to pursue an effective policy in Umbria made the ever available aid of Perugia almost indispensable to Benedict; as a consequence, gracefully or not, the pope had to bear with the usual Perugian propensity to exploit such situations in order to assert a certain independence from the Papacy in its relations with neighbouring towns.<sup>73</sup> This attitude was again to find a faithful reflection in the actions of the chapter.

Within two days of the death of Bishop Hugolinus, the chapter met and elected Franciscus de Gratianis, archpriest of the cathedral, as bishop of Perugia.<sup>74</sup> The election violated a reservation published by Benedict XII on 5 May 1336, which claimed for the Apostolic See all episcopal appointments in the lands of the Church for the next two years and declared null any elections which chapters might attempt in that period. The candidate of the canons was a papal chaplain and *commensalis* and had been awarded several graces by John XXII; he was also the son of a prominent Perugian jurist who had been active in communal affairs. More than a year and a half was to pass before Benedict XII, on 27 February 1339, named Franciscus to the See, specifying that he was convinced to make an exception in this case because of the merits of the candidate; these merits had been acknowl-

<sup>70</sup> Tabarelli, *Liber contractuum*, p. 13 n. 2, notes the commune's gift to the bishop and specifies that two horses were bought with the amount; he concludes that, in his episcopate, Hugolinus was able to remain above the parties and to obtain the esteem of all, so that he appears to have fulfilled the promise implicit in his election.

<sup>71</sup> For the date of death of Hugolinus, see Eubel, *Hierarchia catholica*, p. 396 and Tabarelli, *Liber contractuum*, p. 13 n. 2, where it is also noted that the bishop chose the church of St. Peter as his place of burial.

<sup>72</sup> Partner, *The Lands of St. Peter*, pp. 327-28.

<sup>73</sup> Pecugi Fop, *Il comune di Perugia e la Chiesa*, pp. 23-25, stresses how scandalous Benedict XII professed to find Perugia's usurpations of his own sovereign rights.

<sup>74</sup> P. L. Meloni, 'Sede vacante Perugia all'arrivo dell'Albornoz? Atti di Francesco Graziani dopo l'ordine di spoglio di Clemente VI' in *Storiografia e storia. Studi in onore di Eugenio Duprè Theseider*, 2 vols. (Rome, 1974), 2.689-745, at p. 696

edged by the cardinals in a consistory which had discussed the matter of accepting the chapter's designation despite its violation of the papal reservation.<sup>75</sup>

The procedure followed in the designation of Franciscus was also observed in the election of his successor. The date at which the vacancy occurred is not exactly determinable because the date of Franciscus' death is not known; the traditional view that 1352 was the year in which Franciscus died, however, has been shown to be due to Clement VI's premature order to the treasurer of the Duchy of Spoleto, on 3 November 1352, to exercise the traditional rights of spoil over the goods of the bishop of Perugia.<sup>76</sup> In fact, Franciscus was not at all dead on that date; he survived to be hounded by Clement's successor for his unwillingness to part with some of the wealth which he had accumulated by the grace of the Roman Church in order to assist with the needs of papal representatives in Italy.<sup>77</sup>

The vacancy of the See seems to have occurred sometime after the middle of February 1354.<sup>78</sup> The capitular election took place with great speed. The candidate, Andreas Martini, of the popular family of the Bontempi, held a chair of canon law in the University of Perugia; as a result of his election, he had already resigned his academic position by March of the same year.<sup>79</sup> Innocent VI confirmed the capitular choice on 2 May 1354; he then required the new bishop to pay, over and above the sum of 600 florins which was due as common services, a loan of 4,000 florins in composition for the goods of his predecessor.<sup>80</sup>

The new bishop must have been a young man at his election. He was to hold his See until he died, on 16 July 1390.<sup>81</sup> During his tenure, the effectiveness of

<sup>75</sup> J. M. Vidal, ed., *Benoît XII. Lettres closes et patentes intéressant les pays autres que la France* (Paris, 1913-50), no. 6532; Meloni, 'Sede vacante Perugia', 693-94, 696.

<sup>76</sup> For how the traditional date of 1352 was established (essentially on the strength of Pellini), see Meloni, *ibid.*, 699-700. The premature papal mandate to exercise the rights of spoil is in E. Déprez and G. Mollat, eds., *Les registres de Clement VI. Lettres closes, patentes et curiales intéressant les pays autres que la France* (Paris, 1900-61), no. 2699.

<sup>77</sup> Clement VI, on 26 June 1352, had requested the bishop to make a loan of 6,000 florins to assist the papal war effort in Italy (*Les registres de Clement VI*, no. 2656). The pope's own death removed any necessity for the unwilling bishop to comply with the mandate; Innocent VI, on 4 October 1353, issued a mandate of his own in which he asked the bishop to make a loan of 3,000 florins for the same purposes and reproved him in very strong terms for his ingratitude toward the Apostolic See, whose graces had allowed the bishop to pile up his wealth (P. Gasnault and M.-H. Laurent, eds., *Innocent VI. Lettres secrètes et curiales* [Paris, 1960], no. 576). The bishop's own death allowed him to avoid complying with this mandate. For a full discussion of all these matters, see Meloni, *ibid.*, 718-24.

<sup>78</sup> Meloni, *ibid.*, 723.

<sup>79</sup> *ibid.*, p. 722.

<sup>80</sup> The new bishop made security on 31 June 1354 to pay the sum of 600 florins due for common services (Hoberg, *Taxae pro communibus servitiis*, p. 94); the obligation for the loan was registered on 27 September 1354 (Meloni, *ibid.*, 725).

<sup>81</sup> Eubel, *Hierarchia catholica*, p. 396, where it is noted that, after his promotion to the Sacred College, Bontempi retained the See of Perugia as administrator and ruled it through a vicar general.

Albornoz's action and the return of the Papacy to Rome, both factors which led to violent clashes between Perugia's traditional independence of action and the Papacy's newly determined will to achieve effective control over its dominions, were to bring about the end of Perugia's autonomy within the lands of the Church.<sup>82</sup> Bishop Andreas, who was named a cardinal in 1378, was often to be called upon to act as mediator between his city and the Papacy. He was also to be caught between the competing interests of the city and of the Papacy. Emblematic of the tensions which he was forced to bear was his return to Perugia after being raised to the cardinalate by Urban VI. The magistrates of the city, proud of the honour which had been bestowed upon their bishop and fellow citizen, went to greet him outside the gates, but told him not to enter if he came as a papal representative. The bishop professed that he came as a good citizen and meant to cause no prejudice to Perugia. After this profession, the cardinal, who was the last bishop of Perugia in whose election the chapter had a role to play, made a joyful entry into the city.<sup>83</sup>

What conclusions may we draw from our analysis of the elections of the bishops of Perugia and of the part of the Apostolic See in them? In the first place, it seems possible to draw a distinction between the pre-Avignones and Avignones periods. In the first period, the popes, sometimes lawfully and sometimes less than lawfully, invoked the evolving principles governing their intervention in elections in order to reject almost every election made by the chapter. The same principles were invoked in order to appoint bishops of sure fidelity to the Curia who might aid the ecclesiastical and political programmes of the Apostolic See, or simply to reward faithful servants of the same See. In the Avignones period, distant popes who were in need of the assistance of Perugia in their temporal policies were less disposed to wound local pride; they usually accepted the bold capitular designations of candidates while asserting, in their documents of confirmation, the 'monocephalous' authority of the Roman Pontiff to name bishops.<sup>84</sup> The strife which broke out openly after the election of Hugolinus shows that the communes, or at least the communal authorities of Perugia, knew well that it was possible for them to influence the papal choice of bishop; at the same time, papal nomination

<sup>82</sup> Pecugi Fop, *Il comune di Perugia e la Chiesa*, pp. 35-96; Segoloni, 'Bartolo da Sassoferrato', 649-52, 668-71.

<sup>83</sup> F. Briganti, 'Un protocollo di Pietro Petrioli di Bettona, notaio di Andrea Bontempi Vescovo di Perugia (1356-1359). Appunti di storia giuridica e politica', *Bollettino della R. Deputazione di storia patria per l'Umbria* 23 (1918) 3-114, especially pp. 15-18. Bontempi was appointed to the Sacred College on 18 September 1378 (Eubel, *Hierarchia catholica*, p. 396 n. 9).

<sup>84</sup> For the view that popes like John XXII had not merely a monarchical view of the Church, but a monocephalous one, in which all ecclesial decisions were made to find their origin in the plenitude of power enjoyed by the pope, see R. Manselli, 'Papato avignones and ecclesiologia trecentesca' in *Aspetti culturali della società italiana nel periodo del papato avignones*, pp. 177-95, especially at p. 185.



could avoid the exasperation of party division which could cause so much harm to communal life. If these benefits were to be paid by the funds which the Curia exacted as a result, or by the conflicting loyalties to which the bishop could now become subject, neither the commune nor the successful episcopal candidates appear to have been excessively troubled.

The Perugian Church, through the boldness of its chapter and the relative position of strength in which the city found itself through much of the fourteenth century, was usually able to obtain the appointment of native sons to the episcopacy. It is noteworthy that none of the Perugian bishops whose elections we have canvassed seems to have hungered for translation to richer and more important Sees. In these circumstances, it appears that the link between the bishop of Perugia and his Church was less attenuated than was the case elsewhere, and that the city was still able to see in its chief pastor an embodiment of itself.<sup>85</sup> The Papal State, even in its pre-modern form, was already a body with two souls, one temporal and the other spiritual.<sup>86</sup> The forced cohabitation of these potentially incompatible partners allowed temporal strength to be translated into a measure of freedom in the exercise of traditional capitular electoral rights and into the continuity, in Perugia, of the 'localness' of its bishops and of their identification with chapter and city.<sup>87</sup>

<sup>85</sup> In 1355, at the descent of the emperor Charles IV into Italy, Perugia sent ambassadors who sought and obtained various imperial privileges; among these was the conferral upon the bishop of Perugia of the dignity of count palatine, which allowed him to name notaries and legitimize bastards, and the faculty for him to confer the license and doctorate in the University of Perugia (Heywood, *A History of Perugia*, pp. 216-17; Segoloni, 'Bartolo da Sassoferrato', 653-54, 659-60; Pecugi Fop, *Il comune di Perugia e la Chiesa*, pp. 48-50). For the weakening of the link between bishop and local Church which could follow from papal intervention in episcopal elections, see Manselli, *ibid.*, p. 187; L. Prosdocimi, 'Chiesa e istituzioni ecclesiastiche a Milano di fronte alla formazione dello Stato territoriale' in *Problemi di storia religiosa lombarda* (Como, 1972), pp. 88-100, especially p. 90.

<sup>86</sup> P. Prodi, *Il sovrano pontefice. Un corpo e due anime: la monarchia papale nella prima età moderna* (Bologna, 1982), p. 9.

<sup>87</sup> For the localness of Italian bishops generally and their identification with chapter and city, despite papal provisions, well until the end of the thirteenth century, see Brentano, *Two Churches*, pp. 218-19.

DATED AND DATABLE MANUSCRIPTS  
COPIED IN ENGLAND DURING THE NINTH CENTURY:  
A PRELIMINARY LIST\*

*Jennifer Morrish*

THE ninth century is a period in insular palaeography which has been ignored and for good reason. Anglo-Saxonists, quoting no less an authority than King Alfred, have argued that little in the way of book production was happening at the time because centres of learning, ever a target for the plundering Danes, were in decline. Palaeographers have been slow to venture upon terrain so reputedly barren. The climate is now changing. This article has three objectives: to examine the implications which recent work on insular handwriting has for the dating of insular manuscripts; to establish a preliminary list of the books copied in Anglo-Saxon England in the ninth century; to identify the palaeographical features typical of these codices. A complete list of the ninth-century insular manuscripts which I shall discuss appears in the Appendix (pp. 537-38 below).

I

*A. Insular script before 850 and the dating of manuscripts*

In vol. 2 of *Codices latini antiquiores: A Palaeographical Guide to Latin Manuscripts Prior to the Ninth Century* (= *CLA*), E. A. Lowe acknowledged that he had included certain border-period manuscripts of insular origin whose dates might better fall within the first decade or so after the turn of the ninth century.<sup>1</sup> Among the controversial items, he listed Oxford, Bodleian Library Bodley 819

\* I wish to thank Dr. M. B. Parkes who read several versions of this article and made valuable suggestions at every stage. I am solely responsible for the views expressed. For permission to publish photographs, I gratefully acknowledge the following: the Syndics of Cambridge, University Library, Cambridge (pls. 1, 3); the Bodleian Library, Oxford (pls. 2, 4); the Trustees of the British Library, London (pls. 5-8); the Master and Fellows of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (pl. 9).

<sup>1</sup> E. A. Lowe, *Codices latini antiquiores: A Palaeographical Guide to Latin Manuscripts Prior to the Ninth Century* (= *CLA*) 2, 2nd edition (Oxford, 1972), p. xiii (p. ix, 1st edition Oxford, 1935). When it is necessary to distinguish between the first and second editions in this article, I use the following notation: *CLA* 2<sup>1</sup> = 1st edition; *CLA* 2<sup>2</sup> = 2nd edition. Otherwise *CLA* 2 = *CLA* 2<sup>2</sup>.

(Bede, *In proverbias Salomonis*), Bodley 426 (Philippus, *Expositio in Iob*), and Hatton 93 (*Expositio missae* ['Primum in ordine']).

Lowe's opinion that Bodley 819 originated at Wearmouth-Jarrow was confirmed by M. B. Parkes in 1984.<sup>2</sup> However, Parkes showed that certain aspects of the handwriting in Bodley 819, in particular the occurrence of half-uncial *d*, place the manuscript in the first half of the eighth century.<sup>3</sup> Consequently Bodley 819 is earlier than Lowe had thought.<sup>4</sup>

The handwriting of Bodley 426, fols. 1r-118v, was identified by T. Julian Brown with that in three documents which survive in single sheets contemporary with the dates of the texts (838-847) which they transmit.<sup>5</sup> Thus the date of Bodley 426 is c. 838-847 and approximately two decades later than Lowe's most generous estimate.

The text in Hatton 93 was not identified until 1936, the year after the first edition of *CLA* 2 appeared, when André Wilmart noted that the manuscript transmitted 'Primum in ordine', one of three anonymous explications of the Mass written for the purpose of instructing priests.<sup>6</sup> Wilmart had earlier argued that 'Primum in ordine' originated at the court of Charlemagne after the Capitularies of 789 and/or 802 were issued.<sup>7</sup> He had also indicated that the *terminus ante quem*

<sup>2</sup> M. B. Parkes, *The Scriptorium of Wearmouth-Jarrow* (Jarrow Lecture, 1982), p. 12. See also: *CLA* 2, no. 235; E. A. Lowe, *English Uncial* (Oxford, 1960), pp. 9, 24 and 'A Key to Bede's Scriptorium' in E. A. Lowe, *Palaeographical Papers 1907-65*, ed. L. Bieler, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1972), 2.441-49, especially pp. 444 n. 7, 447.

<sup>3</sup> Parkes, *ibid.*, p. 28 n. 58. On the date of Bodley 819, see also T. J. Brown, 'Late Antique and Early Anglo-Saxon Books' in *Manuscripts at Oxford. R. W. Hunt Memorial Exhibition*, ed. A. C. de la Mare and B. C. Barker-Benfield (Oxford, 1980), pp. 9-14, no. II.7. Facsimiles of Bodley 819 are printed by: Parkes, *ibid.*, pl. 4 (fol. 16r); Brown, *ibid.*, fig. 2 (fol. 11r); Lowe, *English Uncial*, pl. 38e (fol. 79v) and 'A Key', pl. 100A (fol. 79v).

<sup>4</sup> T. J. Brown considered another of Lowe's border-period manuscripts, Durham, Cathedral Library A.IV.19, pp. 177-178 (fol. 89r-v) (Lectionary [fragment]) to be s. viii and thus earlier than the date of s. viii-ix given it in *CLA* 2<sup>1</sup>; cf. his comments in *The Durham Ritual* (Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile 16; Copenhagen, 1969), p. 37. The date given for the fragment in *CLA* 2<sup>2</sup> is s. viii<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> Brown, 'Late Antique', no. II.3. See also *CLA* 2, no. 234 and P. Chaplais, 'The Origin and Authenticity of the Royal Anglo-Saxon Diploma' in *Prisca munimenta. Studies in Archival & Administrative History Presented to Dr A. E. J. Hollaender*, ed. F. Ranger (London, 1973), pp. 28-42, especially pp. 38-39. The charters relating to Bodley 426 are London, British Library Cotton Augustus II.20 and II.37 and Cotton Charter VIII.36; they are nos. 1438 and 298 in P. H. Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Charters* (London, 1968) where full bibliographical details are given. For facsimiles of Bodley 426 see A. G. Watson, *Catalogue of Dated and Datable Manuscripts c. 435-1600 in Oxford Libraries*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1984), I, no. 88 and 2, pl. 7 (fol. 61v); M. Drogin, *Medieval Calligraphy: Its History and Technique* (Montclair, N. J.-London, 1980), pls. 30 (fol. 76r), 95 (fol. 76r); J. J. G. Alexander, *Insular Manuscripts: 6th to the 9th Century* (London, 1978), no. 40 and ill. 136 (fol. 1r).

<sup>6</sup> A. Wilmart, 'Un traité sur la Messe copié en Angleterre vers l'an 800', *Ephemerides liturgicae* 50 (1936) 133-39, especially 134-36. See also *CLA* 2, no. 241.

<sup>7</sup> A. Wilmart, 'Expositio missae' in *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie* 5 (Paris, 1922), cols. 1014-27, especially cols. 1014-16. A recent study continues to endorse Wilmart's date

for 'Primum in ordine' is 822, by which time Rhabanus Maurus had used the text.<sup>8</sup> Wilmart tried to reconcile his conviction that 'Primum in ordine' was a text of ninth-century continental origin with Lowe's date (s. viii-ix) for Hatton 93 and so suggested that this manuscript was copied c. 800 during the episcopacy of Deneberht of Worcester (798-822).<sup>9</sup> This compromise was an improbable one in terms of time. Even if 'Primum in ordine' was composed c. 789, eleven years is not much time to allow for the initial transmission of the text from the Continent to England and its eventual appearance in Hatton 93. Moreover, Cambrai, Bibliothèque Municipale 600-601 (559-558), the only continental witness to the text whose date was considered as early as s. viii-ix when Wilmart wrote, is now regarded as s. x.<sup>10</sup> The earliest manuscripts of continental origin which contain 'Primum in ordine' are s. ix med.<sup>11</sup> Thus the textual history of 'Primum in ordine' and the evidence of the continental copies argue that Hatton 93 belongs firmly in the first half of the ninth century and support Lowe's suspicion that he had dated the codex too early.

The reassessment of the dates of Bodley 819, 426, and Hatton 93 leads to the important conclusion that Lowe's method of discriminating between eighth- and ninth-century insular manuscripts, especially those falling within the period 750-850, is no longer adequate. The criterion upon which Lowe relied heavily for

for 'Primum in ordine'; see F. Brovelli, *La 'Expositio Missae Canonicae'. Edizione critica e studio liturgico-teologico* (Milan, 1979), p. 25 n. 54. With regard to the authorship of 'Primum in ordine', Wilmart rejected the possibility that the work was by Alcuin ('Un traité', 139). F. Unterkircher's recent attempt to establish Alcuin's authorship is lacking in evidence; see his 'Interpretatio canonis Missae in codice Vindobonensi 958' in *Beiträge zur Buchkunde und Kulturgeschichte: Festgabe für Franz Unterkircher zum 80. Geburtstag*, ed. O. Mazal (Graz, 1984), pp. 317-31, especially pp. 321-22.

<sup>8</sup> Wilmart, 'Expositio missae', col. 1023.

<sup>9</sup> Wilmart, 'Un traité', 137-39.

<sup>10</sup> H. Mordek, *Kirchenrecht und Reform im Frankenreich* (Berlin-New York, 1975), p. 244. For an early description of the manuscript, probably responsible for the error in dating, see *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France. Départements* (Octavo Series) 17 (Cambrai) (Paris, 1891), under shelf mark.

<sup>11</sup> The earliest surviving manuscripts of continental origin known at present to transmit 'Primum in ordine' are:

- (1) Bamberg, Staatliche Bibliothek Msc. Lit. 131 (A.II.53), s. ix  $\frac{1}{4}$  or ix/x
- (2) Leningrad, Gosudarstvennaia ordena Trudovogo Krasnogo Znameni Publichnaia biblioteka imeni M. E. Saltykova-Shchedrina Q.v.I.34, probably s. ix ex.
- (3) Rouen, Bibliothèque Municipale 26 (A. 292), s. ix med.
- (4) St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek 446, s. ix  $\frac{3}{4}$
- (5) Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Pal. lat. 485, about s. ix med.

On the dates of these manuscripts, see the list of codices published by S. A. Keefe, 'Carolingian Baptismal Expositions: A Handlist of Tracts and Manuscripts' in *Carolingian Essays: Andrew W. Mellon Lectures in Early Christian Studies*, ed. U.-R. Blumenthal (Washington, D. C., 1983), pp. 169-237, especially pp. 218-25. On the date of Rouen 26 (A.292), see K. D. Hartzell, 'An English Antiphoner of the Ninth Century?', *Revue bénédictine* 90 (1980) 234-47, especially 247 and n. 2.

dating manuscripts was the conformity of their script to certain *Schriftarten*.<sup>12</sup> Lowe appears to have understood pre-ninth-century insular handwriting in terms of two *Schriftarten*, which he considered identifiable from each other by their aspect in general and by the shape of the letter *a* in particular. In comparison to insular minuscule, insular majuscule was 'rounder, more solid, more stately'.<sup>13</sup> The *oc* form of *a* was the defining feature of majuscule, while an *a* composed of a single lobe pinched at the top was characteristic of minuscule. Lowe identified the *oc* graph as his 'shibboleth' for distinguishing majuscule from minuscule. He further believed that the two *Schriftarten* were distinctive in the different uses to which they were put and also inferred that majuscule was historically prior to minuscule because of the priority which insular scribes gave it in the hierarchy of scripts.<sup>14</sup> The development which Lowe saw in early insular handwriting was the evolution of an increasingly minuscule script.<sup>15</sup>

One significant flaw in Lowe's theory is his suggestion that the letter *a* is the criterion for telling majuscule from minuscule. In the plate of Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana C 5 inf. ('Bangor Antiphonary'), which he provides in *CLA* 2 to illustrate insular minuscule, examples are found of a letter *a* looking suspiciously like the shibboleth for majuscule.<sup>16</sup> This failure, then, of the letter *a* to distinguish majuscule from minuscule raises an interesting question. Does it suggest simply that the detail which Lowe isolated was the wrong one on which to base a valid distinction, or does it have the graver implication that to classify early insular handwriting in terms of two *Schriftarten* is itself unsafe?

That the latter is more probable is clear from the study which T. Julian Brown made of the development of insular handwriting c. 600-850.<sup>17</sup> Brown once commented in a lecture that if the origins of insular handwriting were not simple, then they were complex. Where Lowe observed two scripts, majuscule and minuscule, Brown saw a system of several grades of script, identifiable one from the other by the formality with which they were written.<sup>18</sup> The formality could be

<sup>12</sup> On *Schriftarten*, see the review by M. B. Parkes of B. Bischoff, *Paläographie des römischen Altertums und des abendländischen Mittelalters* (Berlin, 1979) in *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 105.2 (1983) 292-96, especially 293.

<sup>13</sup> *CLA* 2, p. xv.

<sup>14</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>15</sup> *ibid.*, pp. xvi, xvii.

<sup>16</sup> *ibid.*, p. xvi and facing plate.

<sup>17</sup> T. J. Brown, 'The Irish Element in the Insular System of Scripts to circa A.D. 850' in *Die Iren und Europa im früheren Mittelalter*, ed. H. Löwe (Stuttgart, 1982), pp. 101-19 and 'The Oldest Irish Manuscripts and Their Late Antique Background' in *Irland und Europa: Die Kirche im Frühmittelalter*, ed. P. Ní Chatháin and M. Richter (Stuttgart, 1984), pp. 311-27.

<sup>18</sup> Brown, 'Irish Element', 101: 'The system of scripts used by Insular scribes down to the ninth century spans a wide range between formal and informal. The basic grade was "cursive" minuscule, a narrow, pointed script for which a pen of moderate thickness was cut at right angles to the shaft, held at the natural "slanting" angle, and used to write an alphabet in which a number of letters were

gauged not only by the shapes and proportions of the letters but also by the angle at which the pen was cut and held and the number of times it was lifted from the page when producing them. The ultimate source of the insular system of grades was evidently the cursive script which Church administrators in Britain had inherited from the Romans in the fourth century and used and thus preserved during the fifth and sixth centuries. How precisely the grades of insular script related to their cursive antecedent(s) and to each other in terms of their development is a complicated question to which Brown gave careful consideration but preferred to leave open. Two of his observations relevant to this problem are characteristically illuminating. First, it is evident that all the insular grades were in use as early as c. 698 at Lindisfarne.<sup>19</sup> Secondly, the highest grade of insular script, called 'half-uncial' by Brown but 'majuscule' by Lowe, was not the source of the minuscule grades but might have been derived from them.<sup>20</sup> M. B. Parkes has recently suggested that insular half-uncial developed from minuscule under the influence of the half-uncial in continental exemplars.<sup>21</sup>

An important corollary accompanies the evidence that ninth-century insular manuscripts have been assigned to the eighth century in *CLA 2* and that Lowe's criteria for dating the script of insular codices need revising: the appearance of a manuscript in *CLA 2* does not eliminate the possibility that the codex properly belongs among items which are ninth century. The question now arises of how best

formed without or nearly without penlifts, notably *a, h, m, n* and *f, p, r, s*. An accelerated version of cursive minuscule, which may be called "current", sometimes links letters as well as parts of letters and makes full use of the numerous ligatures and abbreviations that were known to all Insular scribes. "Set" minuscule on the other hand obtains greater formality by lifting the pen at all the points at which cursive minuscule normally links the parts of letters. The slanting pen-angle of all three grades produces "wedges"—the characteristic thickenings at the tops of some long and short vertical strokes—of which the upper surface slopes downwards to the left. The highest grade of script—better called "half-uncial" but called "majuscule" throughout E. A. Lowe's *Codices Latini Antiquiores*—was written with a rather broad pen cut obliquely for so-called "straight" writing, so that its thickest strokes were vertical and its thinnest horizontal, and the upper surfaces of the wedges were horizontal. Half-uncial in this strict sense was rare, and is found only in the most elaborate manuscripts. Much commoner was the very high grade of minuscule which I call "hybrid", since it borrows from half-uncial the general roundness of aspect that is natural to a straight-pen but not to a slanted-pen script and uses, exclusively or as alternatives, some forms of letters which are characteristic of half-uncial rather than minuscule: the *oc* form of *a*, which Lowe regarded as the "shibboleth" for half-uncial, and uncial *d, n, r* and *s*. The pen-angle, however, is frankly slanting and the bottoms of vertical strokes which end on or below the line are more or less strongly reinforced by a foot-serif on the right, made without lifting the pen. Hybrid minuscule also differs from half-uncial, with which it co-existed, in being a "lighter" script, in which the width of the pen will go into the height of the minim strokes more often than in the "heavier" half-uncial proper.'

<sup>19</sup> *ibid.*, 111.

<sup>20</sup> *ibid.*, 113. See also Brown, 'Oldest Irish Manuscripts', 315.

<sup>21</sup> M. B. Parkes in *The Épinial, Erfurt, Werden and Corpus Glossaries*, ed. B. Bischoff, M. O. Budny, et al. (Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile 22; Copenhagen, 1988), p. 16.

to identify insular manuscripts copied in ninth-century England. In answer, it makes most sense to consider first the ninth-century insular codices whose dates are attributable on grounds which are not palaeographical. From these manuscripts palaeographical characteristics may then be elucidated which appear typical of the ninth century. These features may in turn be used as criteria for dating insular books which are otherwise less easily datable. I shall follow this methodology in constructing a list of ninth-century manuscripts originating in England and shall examine first the items which belong in the first half of the century.

### B. *Dated and datable insular manuscripts (s. IX<sup>1</sup>)*

In addition to Bodley 426, there are three other insular codices whose dates incontrovertibly fall within the first half of the ninth century. These are, in chronological order: London, British Library Cotton Vespasian B.vi, fols. 104r-109v; Cambridge, University Library Ll.1.10, fols. 2r-99v ('Book of Cerne'); and London, British Library Cotton Domitian vii, fols. 15r-45r ('Liber vitae' of Durham). In 1965, R. I. Page observed that Vespasian B.vi is dated to the general period 805 x 814 and to a specific year c. 812 on the basis of the names included by the original text hand in the episcopal lists transmitted in the manuscript.<sup>22</sup> An acrostic in the 'Book of Cerne' preserves the name 'AEDELVALD EPISCOPVS' in its headletters.<sup>23</sup> K. Sisam showed that the form 'Aedelvald' is Mercian.<sup>24</sup> The only Mercian bishop of this name to whom the acrostic could refer is Aedelwaldus of

<sup>22</sup> R. I. Page, 'Anglo-Saxon Episcopal Lists, Parts I and II', *Nottingham Medieval Studies* 9 (1965) 71-95, especially 74-77. Facsimiles: *Catalogue of Dated and Datable Manuscripts c. 700-1600 in The Department of Manuscripts, The British Library*, ed. A. G. Watson, 2 vols. (The British Library, 1979), 1, no. 568 and 2, pl. 4 (fol. 106r); *Catalogue of Ancient Manuscripts in the British Museum, Part II, Latin*, ed. E. M. Thompson (London, 1884), p. 68, pl. 24 (fol. 104r); *The Palaeographical Society: Facsimiles of Manuscripts and Inscriptions*, ed. E. A. Bond and E. M. Thompson, 2 vols. (London, 1873-83), 2, pl. 165 (fol. 107r). The episcopal lists in Cotton Vespasian B.vi have been edited by R. I. Page, 'Anglo-Saxon Episcopal Lists, Part III', *Nottingham Medieval Studies* 10 (1966) 2-24, especially 3-7. The regnal lists in the manuscript have been edited by D. N. Dumville, 'The Anglian Collection of Royal Genealogies and Regnal Lists', *Anglo-Saxon England* 5 (1976) 23-50, especially 30-31. The metrical calendar was edited by A. Wilmart, 'Un témoin anglo-saxon du calendrier métrique d'York', *Revue bénédictine* 46 (1934) 41-69, especially 65-68; on this text see also M. Lapidge, 'A Tenth-Century Metrical Calendar from Ramsey', *Revue bénédictine* 94 (1984) 326-69.

<sup>23</sup> For an edition of 'Cerne' together with an introduction and plates see A. B. Kuypers, *The Prayer Book of Aedeluald the Bishop Commonly Called the Book of Cerne* (Cambridge, 1902) and pls. 1 (fol. 21v [identified as fol. 21]), 2 (fol. 43r). For other facsimiles and bibliography see Alexander, *Insular Manuscripts*, no. 66, ills. 310-15 (fols. 32r, 43r, 2v, 21v, 31v, 12v).

<sup>24</sup> K. Sisam, 'Canterbury, Lichfield, and the Vespasian Psalter', *Review of English Studies* N. S. 7 (1956) 1-10, especially 9-10 and 'Cynewulf and His Poetry', *Studies in the History of Old English Literature* (Oxford, 1953), pp. 1-28, especially pp. 3-6.

Lichfield (818-830).<sup>25</sup> Consequently the acrostic is dated to the period 818-830 and it, in turn, dates the manuscript to the same years. In 1884, E. M. Thompson noted that Cotton Domitian vii is dated c. 840 because of the names included in the regnal lists in the manuscript.<sup>26</sup>

Besides Hatton 93, whose date in the first half of the ninth century can be argued on textual grounds, there are three other insular manuscripts for which there is reasonable evidence to suggest that they also belong in the period. These are: Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 144; London, British Library Royal 2.A.xx; and Harley 2965 ('Book of Nunnaminster'). Lowe dated these three manuscripts s. VIII-IX, s. VIII<sup>2</sup>, and s. VIII-IX respectively.<sup>27</sup> C. J. E. Ball and P. Stiles have recently placed the glossary in CCCC 144 among other witnesses which attest to the latest third stage in the evolution of the Old English sound changes known as smoothing and back-mutation.<sup>28</sup> The other witnesses include the Durham 'Liber vitae', dated c. 840, and Canterbury, DC Chart. Ant. C. 1280, a charter dated 844 x 845.<sup>29</sup> The linguistic evidence argues that the Old English in the Corpus glossary is likewise ninth century. This, in turn, means that the manuscript is ninth century and later than Lowe had thought.

Royal 2.A.xx and the 'Book of Nunnaminster' are volumes of prayers for use in private devotion. This is evident from the regular occurrence in them of pronouns and verbs in the form of the first person singular rather than the first person plural of the liturgy. It is also clear from the small size of the manuscripts,

<sup>25</sup> D. N. Dumville's suggestion that the headletters of the acrostic in 'Cerne' should be emended from 'AEDELVALD' to 'AEDILVALD' to yield the form original to the verse is not convincing; see his 'Liturgical Drama and Panegyric Responsory from the Eighth Century? A Re-examination of the Origin and Contents of the Ninth-Century Section of the Book of Cerne', *Journal of Theological Studies* N. S. 23 (1972) 374-406, especially 388-99.

<sup>26</sup> *Catalogue of Ancient Manuscripts in the British Museum*, pp. 81-84, especially p. 84 and pl. 25 (fol. 36r). See also *Dated and Datable Manuscripts in the British Library* 1, no. 527 and 2, pl. 7 (fol. 21v). Complete facsimile: *Liber vitae ecclesiae Dunelmensis*, ed. A. H. Thompson (Surtees Society 136; London, 1923); see also *Palaeographical Society* (1873-83), pl. 238 (fol. 15r).

<sup>27</sup> *CLA* 2, nos. 122, 215, 199. For the complete facsimile of CCCC 144 and also full bibliography on it, see Parkes and Budny, *The Épinial, Erfurt, Werden and Corpus Glossaries*, pp. 22-28. The text of Royal 2.A.xx was published by Kuypers, *Prayer Book of Aedelwald*, pp. 200-25. Facsimiles of Royal 2.A.xx: Alexander, *Insular Manuscripts*, no. 35 and ill. 133 (fol. 17r); *Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Old Royal and King's Collections*, ed. G. F. Warner and J. P. Gilson, 4 vols. (London, 1921), 1, under shelf mark and 4, pl. 18 a-c (fols. 12r, 17r, 50r); *Catalogue of Ancient Manuscripts in the British Museum*, pp. 60-61, pl. 21 (fol. 14v). The text of the 'Book of Nunnaminster' was published by W. de Gray Birch, *An Ancient Manuscript of the Eighth or Ninth Century Formerly Belonging to St. Mary's Abbey, or Nunnaminster, Winchester* (London, 1889). Facsimiles of the 'Book of Nunnaminster': Alexander, *Insular Manuscripts*, no. 41 and ills. 135, 137-39 (fols. 4v, 11r, 37r, 16v); de Gray Birch, *ibid.*, frontispiece (fol. 16v); *Catalogue of Ancient Manuscripts in the British Museum*, pp. 61-62, pl. 22 (fol. 16v); *Palaeographical Society* (1873-83), 2, pl. 163 (fol. 27r).

<sup>28</sup> C. J. E. Ball and P. Stiles, 'The Derivation of Old English *Geolu* "Yellow", and the Relative Chronology of Smoothing and Back-Mutation', *Anglia* 101 (1983) 5-21, especially 20.

<sup>29</sup> Sawyer, no. 204.



appropriate in codices meant for one user, impractical in books intended for public reading. Like the 'Book of Cerne', Royal 2.A.xx and the 'Book of Nunnaminster' begin with extracts from the gospels followed by a medley of devotional texts, most of them prayers. In both the 'Book of Cerne' and Royal 2.A.xx, the texts have been selected for inclusion on the basis of their relevance to a controlling theme. Items in the 'Book of Cerne' illustrate the theme that God the Father and the Son are the defence of sinners in this life and their salvation, should they seek it, for the world to come. Texts in Royal 2.A.xx play on an image which equates the members of the Godhead with the physician or *medicus* of man, for whom corporeal disease is the emblem of his sinful nature. By contrast, texts in the 'Book of Nunnaminster' lack strict organization, for while many of them relate to a theme of thanksgiving for Christ's Passion, others occur which are extraneous to the central idea, repetitive, or out of logical order.<sup>30</sup> The rigour in the selection of texts in the 'Book of Cerne' and Royal 2.A.xx suggests that the compilations in these manuscripts represent a development in the genre of the private prayerbook which is not yet evident in the text transmitted by the 'Book of Nunnaminster'. Because the 'Book of Cerne' was made, presumably for Bishop Aethelwald, between 818 and 830, it is probable that the compilation in Royal 2.A.xx, if anything more meticulously organized than that in 'Cerne', dates from approximately the same period. It follows that the Royal manuscript is at least contemporary with the 'Book of Cerne'.

The medical imagery in Royal 2.A.xx may offer a further clue to the date of the manuscript. It has recently been suggested that the imagery in which the confessor is compared to a healer and the sins of man to wounds does not appear within the context of English private prayer before a 'Confessio' attributed to Alcuin.<sup>31</sup> In Alcuin's prayer, the penitent enumerates a long list of the parts of his body which have been involved in sin and then seeks medicine from the Lord: 'Non enim haec narrans tuam, Domine, in me blasphemio creaturam, sed meam a te, piissime Deus, exposco medicinam....'<sup>32</sup> Now the extracts from the gospels in Royal 2.A.xx,

<sup>30</sup> For greater detail on the thematic homogeneity or lack thereof in the 'Book of Cerne', Royal 2.A.xx, and the 'Book of Nunnaminster', see my discussion in *An Examination of Literacy and Learning in England in the Ninth Century* (D. Phil. thesis, Oxford, 1982), pp. 202-207.

<sup>31</sup> A. J. Frantzen, *The Literature of Penance in Anglo-Saxon England* (New Brunswick, N. J., 1983), p. 89.

<sup>32</sup> Printed in PL 101.1404-1405. For the attribution of the text to Alcuin, see Frantzen, *ibid.*, p. 89 n. 103 and D. A. Bullough, 'Alcuin and the Kingdom of Heaven: Liturgy, Theology, and the Carolingian Age' in *Carolingian Essays*, pp. 1-69, especially p. 15 and n. 33. Bullough notes that the 'Confessio' is transmitted in Orléans, Bibliothèque Municipale 184 (161), pp. 329-30, an early ninth-century manuscript whose origin Bischoff places in the vicinity of Salzburg (see his *Die südostdeutschen Schreibschulen und Bibliotheken in der Karolingerzeit*, vol. 2: *Die vorwiegend österreichischen Diözesen* [Wiesbaden, 1980], pp. 11, 36). The occurrence of the 'Confessio' in Orléans 184 (161) is important for the question of the Alcuinian authorship of the text; Salzburg manuscripts may have some special claim to authenticity with regard to the texts of Alcuin which they

unlike those in the 'Book of Cerne' and the 'Book of Nunnaminster' which focus on Christ's Passion, concentrate upon Christ curing the sick. Prayers in the Royal manuscript regularly compare Christ to the sinner's doctor. One of the most explicit expressions of the metaphor occurs in a long abecedarial prayer in the section beginning with S which opens by invoking Christ as '*Sancte saluator sanitas pereuntium/ medicus saluberrimus mundalium pre/sumtionum...*' (fol. 35v3-5). The text proceeds to contemplate the wound which Christ received in his side as he hung lifeless on the cross. Through this wound of Christ, the prayer seeks healing for the wounds which man has sustained through sin:

...chryste qui tibi lancea/ latus aperire permisisti. Aperi mihi./ ianuam uitae ingres-  
susque per eam/ confitebor tibi domine deus meus per tuique/ uulnus lateris omnium  
uitiorum/ meorum uulnera per misericordiae/ tuae medicamenta sana. ne umquam/  
ut indignus presumtor tui corporis et/ sanguinis reus efficiar pro meritis propriis/  
meorum peccatorum (fol. 35v6-15).

If it is correct to say that this sort of medical imagery does not appear in English private prayer before Alcuin's 'Confessio', then the many items in Royal 2.A.xx which employ such imagery must post-date Alcuin's text. It is thought that Alcuin wrote his prayer for Charlemagne at whose court he lived from 781 or 782 until 796 except during the years 786 and 790-793 when he was again in England.<sup>33</sup> If Alcuin wrote the 'Confessio' for Charlemagne after he moved to his court, the *terminus post quem* for the text would be 781-782. Alcuin's prayer circulates in some of the 'libelli precum' copied on the Continent in the first half of the ninth century.<sup>34</sup> These dates are consistent with a ninth-century date for the text transmitted in Royal 2.A.xx.

Royal 2.A.xx is not the only one of the early insular prayerbooks to use the medical metaphor. On fol. 30r-v of the 'Book of Nunnaminster', we find a prayer entitled 'De latere domini' whose text is the following:

O medicinae diuinae mirabilis dispensa/tor qui tibi lancea latus aperire permi/sisti,  
Aperi mihi quaeso pulsanti ianuam/ uitae, Ingressusque per eam confitebor tibi per/  
tui uulnus lateris omnium uitiorum meorum/ uulnera per misericordiae tuae  
medicamen/ sana, Ne umquam indignus praesum'p'tor tui/ corporis et sanguinis  
reus efficiar, Pro/ meritis propriis meorum peccatorum, Sed ut/ anima mea

transmit because of the frequent correspondence between Alcuin and Arno of Salzburg. See R. E. Reynolds, 'Pseudonymous Liturgica in Early Medieval Canon Law Collections' in *Fälschungen im Mittelalter*, vol. 2: *Gefälschte Rechtstexte—Der bestrafte Fälscher* (MGH *Schriften* 33.2; forthcoming), nn. 49-51.

<sup>33</sup> See Frantzen, *ibid.*, p. 89 n. 104 and A. Wilmart, *Precum libelli quattuor aevi karolini* (Rome, 1940), p. 21 and n. 4. For a convenient summary of Alcuin's life, see P. Godman, *Alcuin: The Bishops, Kings, and Saints of York* (Oxford, 1982), pp. xxxv-xxxix and the bibliography cited there.

<sup>34</sup> Frantzen, *ibid.*, pp. 88-89; see also Wilmart, *ibid.*, pp. 5-6, 21-24, 56 and n. 1, 73-75.

miserationum tuarum abundantia/ repleata, Ut qui mihi es pretium ipse sis/ et praemium, Domine Iesu Christe Amen., (fol. 30r17-v7).

If the use of the medical metaphor is symptomatic of a ninth-century text, this prayer in the 'Book of Nunnaminster' clearly qualifies for that date and provides a *terminus post quem* for the manuscript. Consequently the date, s. VIII-IX, which Lowe attributed to the 'Book of Nunnaminster', is too early.

A second striking feature of the text in the 'Book of Nunnaminster' is its verbal proximity to section S of the abecedarial prayer in Royal 2.A.xx; indeed the most interesting thing about Royal 2.A.xx and the 'Book of Nunnaminster' is, perhaps, the close relationship between the abecedarial prayer on fols. 29r-38v of the former and the main sequence of prayers of thanksgiving in the latter. Kuypers thought that the cycle in the 'Book of Nunnaminster' was based on the abecedarial text to which Royal 2.A.xx is a witness; however, there are features of the abecedarial prayer which argue against this interpretation, and it is more likely that the prayers in both manuscripts had a common source which the compiler of the text transmitted in Royal 2.A.xx adapted to express the medical theme and the compiler of the cycle in the 'Book of Nunnaminster' used to express prayers of thanksgiving.<sup>35</sup> The literary implications of what the compilers of the texts accomplished are worth investigating, but what is germane to the present inquiry is the evidence that two of the earliest surviving insular prayerbooks contain texts embroidering upon a source which one can only conclude was popular. This detail fits with the notion that insular private prayerbooks, as a genre, were undergoing development between roughly the beginning of the ninth century, as suggested by the medical imagery, and the date of the 'Book of Cerne'. Once interest is kindled, evolution in a literary form tends to occur rapidly.

<sup>35</sup> Kuypers, *Prayer Book of Aedelwald*, p. xviii n. 2. I provided a preliminary discussion (now in need of revision) of the relationship between the text in the 'Book of Nunnaminster' and the abecedarial prayer in Royal 2.A.xx in *An Examination of Literacy*, pp. 213-17. If the text in the 'Book of Nunnaminster' had been derived from the abecedarial prayer in the Royal manuscript, as Kuypers thought, one would expect to see more evidence in 'Nunnaminster' of the key alphabetical words in the Royal prayerbook than one finds. On the prayerbooks in general, see: T. H. Bestul, 'Continental Sources of Anglo-Saxon Devotional Writing' in *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Culture*, ed. P. E. Szarmach (Kalamazoo, 1986), pp. 103-26; H. Gneuss, 'Liturgical Books in Anglo-Saxon England and Their Old English Terminology' in *Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England: Studies Presented to Peter Clemoes on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. M. Lapidge and H. Gneuss (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 91-141, especially pp. 137-38; D. G. Bzdył, 'Prayer in Old English Narratives', *Medium Aevum* 51 (1982) 135-51, especially 137-40; R. Constantinescu, 'Alcuin et les "Libelli Precum" de l'époque carolingienne', *Revue d'histoire de la spiritualité* 50 (1974) 17-56; K. Hughes, 'Some Aspects of Irish Influence on Early English Private Prayer', *Studia celtica* 5 (1970) 48-61; W. Levison, *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century* (Oxford, 1946), pp. 147, 295-302; E. Bishop, *Liturgica historica* (Oxford, 1918), pp. 139-51, 165-70, 173-74, 192-97 and 'Liturgical Note' in Kuypers, *Prayer Book of Aedelwald*, pp. 234-83.

Thus far there are four manuscripts which we may attribute to the ninth century because of dated evidence (Cotton Vespasian B.vi, the 'Book of Cerne', Cotton Domitian vii, and Bodley 426), one manuscript which we may regard as ninth century because of textual evidence (Hatton 93), and three manuscripts which we may infer are ninth century because of linguistic and literary evidence (CCCC 144, Royal 2.A.xx, and the 'Book of Nunnaminster'). An examination of three of the dated manuscripts (the 'Book of Cerne', Cotton Domitian vii, and Bodley 426) and Hatton 93 indicates that there are palaeographical features which these manuscripts share. Although Cotton Vespasian B.vi is also a dated book, it is a comparatively informal product and may lack or exhibit only minimally characteristics which are pronounced in the other four codices. Cotton Vespasian B.vi is chiefly important as a reminder that insular book production was more varied in the first half of the ninth century than most of the dated evidence suggests.

C. *Palaeographical features of dated insular manuscripts (s. ix<sup>1</sup>) and Hatton 93*

(1) Cursive minuscule is acknowledged as a legitimate book hand subject to calligraphic treatment. This attitude to cursive minuscule declares itself both in the prominent use made of it as a text grade in the 'Book of Cerne', Bodley 426, and Hatton 93, and also in a mannered, if exuberant, elaboration of graphic detail. Delicate finials are regularly applied to the last stroke of many letters, including **a**, **h**, **l**, **m**, and **r**, especially when these letters are themselves in the final position in words. The *ductus* of the horizontal strokes in **e**, **g**, and **t** is subject to uninhibited protraction. Features of letters which were once purely utilitarian in the distant cursive antecedents of cursive minuscule are highly stylized and serve a purpose which is as much decorative as it is functional. Thus, in the 'Book of Cerne', the letters **d** and **q**, when first in a word, preserve the antique approach strokes by which they are joined to the letters preceding them, but the approach strokes as well as the bowls of **d** and **q** are modified by a strict *ductus*. The letter **d** may maintain a looped ascender which no longer serves to join it to the following letter but is simply ornamental. Ligatures may lose their originally fluid time-saving *ductus* and become, instead, deliberate and artificial as in examples of **gi**, **si**, and **ti**. The decorative element inherent in the calligraphic treatment of cursive minuscule becomes overtly manifest at times as, for example, when the scribe of 'Cerne' attaches zoomorphic ornament to words and runover signs in passages of text (fols. 88-98) or when the hand of Hatton 93 fashions the finial in which a letter **m** ends as a leaf (fol. 24v6) and proceeds in the next line of his page to form the **i** of a ligature of **s** and **i** in the same way.

(2) Insular half-uncial tends to be used for display purposes rather than for text. Hybrid minuscule is the grade which is preferred in formal contexts.<sup>36</sup> Formal

<sup>36</sup> On the insular use of hybrid minuscule in place of half-uncial, see Brown, 'Irish Element', 110.

contexts are no longer primarily large, often biblical, manuscripts intended for corporate use but include books of small format which transmit specialist texts, like Cotton Domitian vii. The scribes' approach to hybrid minuscule is as mannered as that which they take to cursive minuscule.

(3) In two of the manuscripts copied primarily in cursive minuscule, the 'Book of Cerne' and Bodley 426, there is also an easy and integrated use of the higher grades in the insular system. These are employed for purposes of display to identify a passage of comparative importance in the text or to demarcate the beginning of major units of text, thereby clarifying the organization of the manuscript as a whole. Thus the scribe of the 'Book of Cerne' indicates that the passages in the gospel extracts which treat of Christ's resurrection are significant for the theme of his book by interrupting his use of cursive minuscule when he comes to them and writing their opening words in hybrid. An extremely intricate example of this scribe's deployment of the hierarchy of grades to signalize the opening of texts occurs at the beginning of each of the sets of gospel extracts. The excerpt from Matthew starts with fifteen lines in the course of which the copyist works his way through display capitals of two sizes (ll. 1-3) and three grades of insular script (half-uncial, l. 4; hybrid minuscule, ll. 5-14; cursive minuscule, l. 15). The scribe of Bodley 426 relies on the same technique as, for example, at the beginning of book 2 of Philipppus' Commentary on Job, where we find a rubric in set minuscule (fol. 61v18-19), the first five words of book 2 in hybrid (l. 20), and the subsequent text in cursive minuscule.<sup>37</sup> This descent through several grades of insular script for purposes of display is uncommon, if it occurs at all, in manuscripts copied in Anglo-Saxon England prior to the ninth century, and it is evidently the natural result of the increasing centrality of cursive minuscule as a book hand. Once cursive minuscule is the grade adopted for copying texts, higher grades in the insular system are freed up for other uses.

The only one of the dated ninth-century manuscripts written in a high grade of insular script is Cotton Domitian vii copied in hybrid minuscule.<sup>38</sup> Because the evidence is limited, one is cautious in drawing general conclusions from the manuscript. Nevertheless one cannot fail to notice that while the titles of the lists in Cotton Domitian vii are written in the same hybrid minuscule as the lists themselves, the first name in certain cases is copied in a display script whose letters are either a combination of uncials and square capitals or simply rustic capitals.<sup>39</sup>

<sup>37</sup> On the grades used in Bodley 426 at the beginning of book 2 of Philipppus' Commentary on Job, see Brown, 'Late Antique', 13, II.3.

<sup>38</sup> On the hybrid minuscule in Cotton Domitian vii, see Brown, 'Irish Element', 110.

<sup>39</sup> See col. a2 on the following folios: 15r(12r), 16r(13r), 18r(15r), 18v(15v), 19v(16v), 20r(17r), 21v(18v), 26r(23r), 27r(24r), 37r(34r). The number in parentheses represents an obsolete foliation most clearly visible in the facsimile.

Although the use of antique display in a book otherwise written in hybrid minuscule is not frequent before the ninth century, eighth-century scribes at Wearmouth-Jarrow had already combined antique capitals with lower grades of insular minuscule in such codices as Bodley 819 and the Leningrad Bede.<sup>40</sup> Thus the precedent for the mixing of models attested in Cotton Domitian vii is found in the insular tradition itself. At the same time, if the antique display in Cotton Domitian vii is considered in the context of the date (c. 840) of the manuscript, its gold and silver ink, and its leaf ornament suggestive of acanthus, one is encouraged to infer the influence of Carolingian models in which display in antique letters is regularly combined with Carolingian minuscule, the disciplined descendant of local continental minuscules.<sup>41</sup>

(4) In the 'Book of Cerne', Bodley 426, and Hatton 93, there is a conspicuous rigour in the laying out of texts in cursive minuscule which reveals itself most obviously in two features. The left margin of texts is justified. Secondly, *litterae notabiliores* and *signes de renvoie*, like the letter K in Bodley 426 which denotes the beginning of lemmata, are meticulously lined up one under the other in a column of space to the left of the text.<sup>42</sup> The ninth-century manuscripts in cursive minuscule owe the cartesian quality of their layout to traditions established by earlier insular codices, specifically the Leningrad Bede (731-747), in which the discipline of Italian models was married to texts copied in the basic grade of insular script.<sup>43</sup> The discipline of layout long characteristic of insular codices in a higher grade of native script or in an imported script of antiquity continues to be evident in the strictly aligned columns of Domitian vii.<sup>44</sup>

(5) Word separation tends to be good and to be indicated by clearly defined spaces of predictable dimensions left between words.<sup>45</sup>

<sup>40</sup> Leningrad, Gosudarstvennaia ordena Trudovogo Krasnogo Znameni Publichnaia biblioteka imeni M. E. Saltykova-Shchedrina Q.v.I.18. See M. B. Parkes, *Scriptorium*, p. 17 and 'The Contribution of Insular Scribes of the Seventh and Eighth Centuries to the "Grammar of Legibility"' in *Grafia e interpunzione del latino nel medioevo*, ed. A. Maiorè (Rome, 1987), pp. 15-30, especially pp. 26-27.

<sup>41</sup> On Carolingian minuscule, see the important note by B. Bischoff, 'Die karolingische Minuskel' in *Karl der Grosse: Werk und Wirkung* (Aachen, 1965), pp. 207-10.

<sup>42</sup> See pl. 4.

<sup>43</sup> On the discipline imposed on insular minuscule at Wearmouth-Jarrow, see Parkes, *Scriptorium*, passim and also Brown, 'Irish Element', 115.

<sup>44</sup> London, British Library Cotton Nero D.iv ('Lindisfarne Gospels'), copied at Lindisfarne c. A.D. 696-698, brings the discipline of imported Italian *exemplaria* to insular half-uncial (see Brown, 'Irish Element', 108). For the complete facsimile of Cotton Nero D.iv, see *Evangeliorum quattuor Codex Lindisfarnensis*, ed. T. D. Kendrick, T. J. Brown et al., 2 vols. (Olten-Lausanne, 1956-60).

<sup>45</sup> Bodley 426, whose layout suggests that it derives from a half-uncial manuscript copied in *scriptura continua*, is exceptional among ninth-century insular books in its method of designating the boundaries of words. While it does use spaces for this purpose, the manuscript also relies on graphic features. Thus certain letters like *i longa* and underslung *l* are most common initially in a word; *a*, *e*, *m*, *r*, and *t* often terminate in a delicate finial especially if they are final letters. Two graphs of *a*

The palaeographical features which are typical of the dated ninth-century manuscripts and Hatton 93 as a group are also attested in CCCC 144, Royal 2.A.xx and the 'Book of Nunnaminster'. Of the three latter codices, Royal 2.A.xx is particularly worthy of note in that it exhibits most of the characteristics evident in the members of the first group. Although the Royal manuscript is small and intended for an individual, nevertheless it is written in part in an elegant hybrid minuscule, a grade which would have been more happily at home in the first half of the eighth century in a grander public volume. Royal 2.A.xx makes fluent use of more than one grade of insular script to distinguish one kind of text from another or one part of a text from another. Consequently the main scribe of the codex employs the formal hybrid in copying the texts of fundamental importance to his faith, namely, the excerpts from the Gospels, the Lord's Prayer, and the Creed, but uses the more informal, probably set, minuscule for texts which are simply devotional. Another very good example of the main scribe's sensitivity to the implications of the hierarchy of the insular grades is apparent in the litany (fol. Plate 5 26r-v) in which the names of the saints invoked are inscribed in hybrid while the requests of the one at prayer are humbly consigned to a lower grade.<sup>46</sup> Both the hybrid and set minuscule of Scribe 1 and the cursive minuscule of the second hand Plate 6 in the manuscript are calligraphic and mannered. Texts are laid out with meticulous attention to the vertical alignment of *litterae notabiliores*, left margins, and columns. Word separation is clearly demarcated by spaces. If ever a manuscript had details of palaeography in common with ninth-century insular codices, that manuscript is Royal 2.A.xx.

CCCC 144 and the 'Book of Nunnaminster' are both copied in hybrid minuscule, though the latter also contains folia (37r-41v) at its close written in a more informal grade, probably by a second scribe.<sup>47</sup> In its hybrid minuscule, the

letter, particularly when the letter is s, are often given identical shapes when they are geminates within a word; when one s occurs finally in a word and the following s occurs initially in the next word, the shapes of the letters are varied. The cross-strokes of g and t may be protracted over whole syllables, thus drawing the parts of one word together. By using graphic conventions such as these, the scribe of Bodley 426 can define the boundaries of words without resorting to leaving spaces between them. It is interesting to note that even where the scribe has employed spaces to separate words, he often camouflages this by elaborating parts of final or initial letters within the intervening space. Unlike their Irish counterparts, who invented the practice of putting clearly visible spaces between words of a Latin text, the Anglo-Saxons were traditionally restrained in their use of this device, particularly if they were copying from an exemplar in *scriptura continua*. See Parkes, 'The Contribution of Insular Scribes', 15-30, especially 24-26, and P. Saenger, 'Silent Reading: Its Impact on Late Medieval Script and Society', *Viator* 13 (1982) 367-414, especially 377-79.

<sup>46</sup> A list of manuscripts of Anglo-Saxon origin or provenance which contain litanies has been compiled by M. Lapidge, 'Litanies of the Saints in Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: A Preliminary List', *Scriptorium* 40 (1986) 264-77. (Royal 2.A.xx is no. 26 in this list.)

<sup>47</sup> On the palaeography of CCCC 144, see Parkes, *The Épinial, Erfurt, Werden and Corpus Glossaries*, pp. 22-25 and also *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*, ed. N. R. Ker

'Book of Nunnaminster', like Royal 2.A.xx, offers a notable example of the appropriation of the formal grades in the insular system for use in an individual's small volume. The handwriting in both CCCC 144 and the 'Book of Nunnaminster' has a fussy artificial quality. Their layout of texts preserves a strict alignment of left margin and column. The Corpus glossary provides a particularly stunning example of precision layout in the disposition of many of its columns where not only are the left margins crisply justified, but even the letters within words are carefully placed under letters in the line above. Word separation is clearly designated by spaces. As in Royal 2.A.xx, palaeographical features in CCCC 144 and the 'Book of Nunnaminster' corroborate the linguistic and literary evidence which implies that all three codices are ninth century.

*D. Insular manuscripts attributable to s. ix<sup>1</sup> on palaeographical grounds*

The manuscripts just examined allow us to isolate certain features of their palaeography which are distinctive of insular codices copied in the ninth century. We may now ask whether these characteristics can be observed in otherwise undated codices. In answer, there are at least seven items which exhibit appropriate features. This number may increase as other insular manuscripts, particularly among those now listed in *CLA*, are reexamined. But for the present, the seven are:

(1) London, British Library Harley 7653 (prayers).

The scribe of the Harleian fragment used a formal hybrid minuscule to copy a small prayerbook whose owner was evidently a woman.<sup>48</sup> The hybrid, though lacking in confidence, shows some mannerisms. The layout is simplistic but defined in terms of its vertical boundaries. Word separation is clear. The fragment preserves no evidence that the scribe deployed the hierarchy of insular grades. Features of the palaeography of Harley 7653 lack the maturity apparent in the 'Book of Nunnaminster', Royal 2.A.xx, and the 'Book of Cerne'. At the same time, Harley 7653 shared an early provenance with Royal 2.A.xx.<sup>49</sup> The evidence suggests that Harley 7653 was a very early product of the phase of development in prayerbooks which also yielded the 'Book of Nunnaminster', Royal 2.A.xx and the 'Book of Cerne'. For that reason, the date of Harley 7653 is most likely turn-of-the-century, that is, s. VIII-IX or s. IX in.

(Oxford, 1957), no. 36. On the palaeography of the 'Book of Nunnaminster', see Brown, 'Irish Element', 110 and M. B. Parkes, 'The Palaeography of the Parker Manuscript of the *Chronicle*, Laws and Sedulius, and Historiography at Winchester in the Late Ninth and Tenth Centuries', *Anglo-Saxon England* 5 (1976) 149-71, especially 158.

<sup>48</sup> On Harley 7653, see *CLA* 2, no. 204. The text is printed in *The Antiphonary of Bangor* 2, ed. F. E. Warren (Henry Bradshaw Society 10; London, 1895), pp. 83-86 and 87-97. Facsimile: *Catalogue of Ancient Manuscripts in the British Museum*, p. 61, pl. 23 (fol. 2v). On the early ownership of Harley 7653, see Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*, no. 244.

<sup>49</sup> *CLA* 2, no. 204; Ker, *ibid.*, no. 244.



(2) Cambridge, University Library Add. 3330 (2 leaves) + London, British Library Add. 50483K (1 leaf) + Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum Ludwig XI 5 [olim William Merton Collection 41] (1 bifolium) + New Haven, Yale University, Beinecke Library 401 [olim Phillipps 8071] (26 leaves) + 401A [olim Phillipps 20688, fols. 9-10] (2 leaves) + Oxford, Bodleian Library Don. f. 458 (part of 2 leaves) + Lat. th. d. 24 (2 leaves) + Philadelphia, Free Library Lewis ET 121 (1 leaf) (Aldhelm, *De laude virginitatis*).

The deliberate, decorative nature of its hybrid minuscule and precise layout are enough to suggest that the copy of Aldhelm's *De laude virginitatis*, now surviving in thirty-eight *membra disiecta*, was produced in the first half of the ninth century.<sup>50</sup> Moreover the handwriting is close to, though not identical with, that in two charters whose dates suggest that the Aldhelm was copied early in the century. The charters are London, British Library Add. Charter 19790 (A.D. 793 x 796) and Cotton Augustus II.79 (A.D. 805 x 810).<sup>51</sup>

(3) Salisbury, Cathedral Library 117, fols. 163-164 + Oxford, Bodleian Library Lat. Bib. c. 8 (P) + Tokyo, Private Collection (olim Geneva, Martin Bodmer Collection S. N.; Phillipps 36183) (Num 27:22-28:25, Dt 24:4-25:10, 31:9-32:6, 32:12-34:12).

The cursive minuscule in the Salisbury biblical fragment is so close to the handwriting in Hatton 93 that Lowe considered the two as products of one scriptorium.<sup>52</sup> Layout and word separation in the fragment also compare with the same features in Hatton 93. The palaeographical similarities between the Salisbury fragment and Hatton 93 suggest that the manuscripts are contemporary.

<sup>50</sup> On the Aldhelm fragment and additional bibliography pertinent to it, see: *Die Handschriften der Sammlung Ludwig* 3, ed. A. von Euw (Cologne, 1982), no. XI 5 and plate (fol. 1v); N. R. Ker, 'A Supplement to *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*', *Anglo-Saxon England* 5 (1976) 121-31, no. 12; *Anglo-Saxon Vernacular Manuscripts in America*, ed. R. L. Collins (New York, 1976), p. 25, nos. Ia-Ib and pls. 1-2 (Yale University, Beinecke Library 401, fol. 7r and Philadelphia, Free Library Lewis ET 121); *Illuminated Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library Oxford*, vol. 3: *British, Irish and Icelandic Schools*, ed. O. Pächt and J. J. G. Alexander (Oxford, 1973), no. 9; Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*, no. 12; E. A. Lowe, 'Membra disiecta', *Revue bénédictine* 39 (1927) 185-97, especially 191-92, no. 89. Cambridge Add. 3330 + New Haven 401 (olim Phillipps 8071) = P in the edition by R. Ehwald, 'Aldhelmus. *De virginitate*. I. Prosa' in *Aldhelmi opera* (MGH *Auct. antiq.* 15; Berlin, 1919), pp. 209-323, especially pp. 214, 225. Oxford Lat. th. d. 24, which Ehwald did not realize belonged with Cambridge Add. 3330 and Phillipps 8071, = 'frgt. Oxon.' in the edition.

<sup>51</sup> Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Charters*, nos. 139, 1188.

<sup>52</sup> *CLA* 2, nos. 241, 259. Facsimiles: H. P. Kraus, *Monumenta codicum manuscriptorum. An Exhibition Catalogue of Manuscripts of the 6th to the 17th Centuries from the Libraries of the Monasteries of St. Catherine...* (New York, 1974), no. 4 (olim Martin Bodmer, S. N.); H. P. Kraus, *Catalogue 126. Choice Books and Manuscripts from Distinguished Private Library* (New York, [1971]), no. 8 (olim Martin Bodmer, S. N.). On the history of the former Bodmer fragment, see E. Pellegrin, *Manuscripts latins de la Bodmeriana* (Cologny-Geneva, 1982), p. 458, no. 5.

(4)-(5) London, British Library Cotton Tiberius C.ii (Bede, *Historia ecclesiastica*); Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 10861 (*Vitae sanctorum*).

Plate 7

The centrality and the quality of the cursive minuscule, the layout, and the word separation in Cotton Tiberius C.ii and Paris lat. 10861 all argue that the manuscripts are ninth century. However, the piece of evidence which is most persuasive of the date of the codices is the fluent and intelligent use which they make of different grades of insular script to mark the beginning of major sections of text. Thus at the opening of each of the five books of the *Historia ecclesiastica* in Cotton Tiberius C.ii, we find a line of enlarged display capitals embellished with zoomorphic ornament, followed by several lines, a page or two pages of a formal minuscule grade, probably hybrid, followed by the cursive minuscule of the text.<sup>53</sup> The list of capitula preceding each book is set out in a grade of minuscule more or less equivalent to the cursive minuscule of the text. The list of chapters is rubricated at the beginning and end in a formal grade. In the deployment of grades in Cotton Tiberius C.ii, it is also interesting to observe that a subsequent, though not much later, hand clearly understood the decorum which governed the use of the hierarchy. This scribe imported a lowly reader's aid into the manuscript in the form of short Latin-vernacular glossaries for words in Bede's text.<sup>54</sup> He placed these at the end of the lists of capitula for books 1-3 and at the end of book 4 and wrote them in an informal grade of insular minuscule as befitted his humble additions. The expertise evident in the use of the insular grades in Cotton Tiberius C.ii is also shown on the opening pages of the Paris manuscript where the legendary begins with a line of enlarged decorated display capitals, followed by two lines in formal hybrid, followed by a page of highly ornamental set minuscule, followed by the cursive minuscule of the text.<sup>55</sup> The palaeographical features of both Cotton Tiberius C.ii and Paris lat. 10861 are

<sup>53</sup> *CLA* 2, no. 191. On the hybrid minuscule in Cotton Tiberius C.ii, see Brown, 'Irish Element', 110. Facsimiles: Alexander, *Insular Manuscripts*, no. 33, ills. 134 (fol. 60v), 165 (fol. 5v). On the text of Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica* transmitted in Cotton Tiberius C.ii, see B. Colgrave and R. A. B. Mynors, *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People* (Oxford, 1969), p. xlii. (Cotton Tiberius C.ii = C in this edition.) A fragment of the *Historia ecclesiastica* (5.13), in Anglo-Saxon minuscule, preserved under the shelf marks Bloomington, Indiana University, Lilly Library Ricketts 177 + Düsseldorf, Universitätsbibliothek K1: B. 216, was regarded as 'eighth-century' by Colgrave and Mynors (p. xlv n. 5a). Bischoff has recently noted that the fragment is s. ix in. (see B. Bischoff and V. Brown, 'Addenda to *Codices latini antiquiores*', *Mediaeval Studies* 47 [1985] 317). Although J. J. John suggested that the origin of the fragment was 'probably England' (see his 'Latin Paleography' in *Medieval Studies: An Introduction*, ed. J. M. Powell [Syracuse, 1976] p. 15 and fig. 1.7), the *m*-text, the handwriting, and the Düsseldorf provenance of the leaves indicate that they originated in a centre on the continent—probably in Germany (?Werden)—which had insular traditions (cf. *CLA* Supplement, no. 1686). I am grateful to M. B. Parkes for his comments on the Bloomington-Düsseldorf fragments.

<sup>54</sup> Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*, no. 198.

<sup>55</sup> On the date, origin, script, and decoration in Paris lat. 10861, see the recent study by M. P. Brown, 'Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 10861 and the Scriptorium of Christ Church, Canterbury', *Anglo-Saxon England* 15 (1986) 119-37 and pls. 1 (fol. 2r) and 4a (fol. 75v) (Paris lat. 10861, fol. 2r [first text-page]). See also Alexander, *Insular Manuscripts*, no. 67, ill. 319 (fol. 2r).

reminiscent of the 'Book of Cerne', the former strikingly so. It is therefore likely that both manuscripts are of about the same date as the 'Book of Cerne'.

- (6) London, British Library Royal 1.E.vi + Oxford, Bodleian Library Lat. bib. b. 2 (P) + Canterbury, Cathedral Library Add. 16 (Gospels, Acts).

Several palaeographical characteristics of Royal 1.E.vi immediately raise suspicion that the codex is ninth century: its choice of hybrid minuscule rather than half-uncial as the grade for a large, deluxe, biblical manuscript; the highly mannered, self-conscious quality of its hybrid; the rectilinearity of its layout; the clear spacing between the words of its text.<sup>56</sup> Added to these symptoms are display capitals patterned after the square capital and uncial models of antiquity and written in their most ostentatious form in the manuscript in gold and silver ink on leaves of purple parchment. The smaller square capital and uncial display, which introduces Jerome's letter to Pope Damasus (fol. 2r), subtly indicates that the antique graphs could be perfectly integrated into the design of a page otherwise written in insular hybrid. The extent to which the mixing of graphic models has been taken in Royal 1.E.vi is further evident from the use which the manuscript makes at the ends of lines of uncial letters, particularly a, b, l, and m, as variant graphs.<sup>57</sup> The degree to which the use of antique graphs for display and other purposes has become second nature to the scribes of Royal 1.E.vi implies that the codex must be at least as late as Cotton Domitian vii.

Plate 8

- (7) Berne, Burgerbibliothek 671 (Gospels).

The Berne manuscript of the Gospels, evidently produced in a southwest British centre in the general region of Cornwall, was copied by two scribes who rely, for the most part, on a grade of insular minuscule which can best be described as cursive with current tendencies.<sup>58</sup> The latter reveal themselves in a freer use of ligatures and in fewer penlifts within or between letters than one would expect to find in a straightforward example of cursive minuscule. In spite of its current properties, the handwriting of Berne 671 has a calligraphic mannered quality. This feature, combined with the smooth expertise of its layout, gives the manuscript a general appearance suggestive of Bodley 426. Although, if Lindsay was right, the origin of Berne 671 makes it unique among surviving insular manuscripts, nevertheless the

<sup>56</sup> *CLA* 2, nos. 214, 244. On the hybrid minuscule in Royal 1.E.vi, see Brown, 'Irish Element', 110. Facsimiles: Alexander, *Insular Manuscripts*, no. 32, ills. 160-64 (fols. 44r, 43r, 4r, 4v, 6r). On the art of Royal 1.E.vi and the evidence which it provides for dating the manuscript, see M. O. Budny, *British Library Manuscript Royal 1. E. VI: The Anatomy of an Anglo-Saxon Bible Fragment*, 3 vols. (Ph. D. thesis, London, 1985).

<sup>57</sup> See *CLA* 2, no. 214.

<sup>58</sup> W. M. Lindsay, *Early Welsh Script* (Oxford, 1912), no. 3, pl. 4-5 (fols. 1v, 74v). Other facsimiles: O. Homburger, *Die illustrierten Handschriften der Burgerbibliothek Bern. Die vorkarolingischen und karolingischen Handschriften* (Berne, 1962), pp. 31-32 and pl. xxii, 52, 58 (fols. 1v, 23r); *The New Palaeographical Society: Facsimiles of Ancient Manuscripts, etc.*, ed. E. M. Thompson, G. F. Warner et al., Second Series, 2 vols. (London, 1913-30), 1, pl. 11a-d (fols. 22r, 23r, 43r, 59r).

palaeographical features which the codex has in common with the books copied in the first half of the ninth century suggest that it was made at about the same time.

\*  
\* \* \*

Two general conclusions can be drawn from the fifteen insular manuscripts which can be attributed to the first half of the ninth century. First, these books argue that traditions in writing the insular grades had been maintained and indeed developed to a level previously unobserved. This is evident both in the mannerisms which characterize ninth-century script and also in the clear sense which copyists had of the purpose to which each grade should properly be put. Moreover, the use which the scribes made of antique display in combination with insular script suggests their willingness and ability to mix models. In this context it is interesting to observe that copyists did not borrow Carolingian minuscule. The reason for this must be explained partly by the extraordinary level of development which insular script and the hierarchy of grades had achieved in the ninth century. Not only had insular script undergone the sort of 'fine-tuning' which resulted in Carolingian minuscule on the Continent, but the cognitive deployment of grades, feasible in insular script, was not possible in Carolingian minuscule.

The second general observation which needs to be made about insular manuscripts of s. ix<sup>1</sup> has to do with their number. The paucity of the codices which we can at present attribute to the period has far less significance as historical evidence of literate culture than has the quality of the manuscripts. The number of books which are extant, in particular for a period as remote and linguistically especial as the insular period, tells us more about hazards of survival and our own inability to date manuscripts accurately than about the number of codices originally made and the significance of that number. By contrast, the quality of book production evident in a manuscript usually has an absolute value if the standard is high, as it generally is in the ninth-century insular books which we have examined. If one typically finds, as we have seen, scribes who conscientiously exploit highly developed graphic features to disambiguate and clarify the meaning of the written word, one has to infer, irrespective of the number of codices, some scribal and reading population familiar with and discerning of the production and use of books.<sup>59</sup>

<sup>59</sup> My view of the manuscript evidence differs from that expressed by H. Gneuss, 'King Alfred and the History of Anglo-Saxon Libraries' in *Modes of Interpretation in Old English Literature. Essays in Honour of Stanley B. Greenfield* (Toronto, 1986), pp. 29-49, especially pp. 36-38, and 'Anglo-Saxon Libraries from the Conversion to the Benedictine Reform' in *Angli e sassoni al di qua e al di là del mare 2* (Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo 32.2; Spoleto, 1986), pp. 643-99, especially pp. 672-79.

## II

A. *Dated insular manuscripts (s. ix<sup>2</sup>)*

Six items of insular origin can be attributed to the second half of the ninth century on the basis of evidence which is datable. They are:

## (1) Oxford, Bodleian Library Digby 63 (computus).

The *terminus ante quem* of Digby 63 is evidently 892, which is the last year to be found in the Dionysian paschal tables occupying the first quire. Because the practical application of books of computus lay, among other things, in their tables for calculating the date of Easter, it is probable that the scribe of Digby 63 would have added another nineteen-year cycle to his table had the year 892 been exceeded by the time he copied his book. The *terminus post quem* of Digby 63 is provided by a direction on fol. 20v for determining the year of the Christian era; the year to which the directions have reference is 867.<sup>60</sup>

## (2)-(3) Berne, Burgerbibliothek 671, fol. 74v19-31 (Alfred acrostics); London, British Library Add. 23211, fols. 1-2 (computus, royal genealogies, Old English Martyrology).

Berne 671, fol. 74v19-31 and the British Library Additional fragment each contain material which pertains to King Alfred; the former preserves two acrostics in praise of Alfred<sup>61</sup> and the latter transmits a genealogy of West-Saxon kings which stops at Alfred.<sup>62</sup> This evidence suggests that the Berne acrostics and Add. 23211 were copied during Alfred's regnal years (871-899).

<sup>60</sup> Watson, *Dated and Datable Manuscripts in Oxford* 1, no. 419 and 2, pl. 12 (fol. 26r); Morrish, *An Examination of Literacy*, p. 102. On the origin of Digby 63, see: Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*, no. 319; Morrish, *ibid.*, pp. 132-33; E. Bishop, 'Addenda' in *The Bosworth Psalter*, ed. F. A. Gasquet and E. Bishop (London, 1908), pp. 145-78. The comments on the origin of Digby 63 published by D. Ó Cróinín in his review of *Insular Latin Studies: Papers on Latin Texts and Manuscripts of the British Isles 550-1066*, ed. M. W. Herren (Toronto, 1981) in *Peritia* 1 (1982) 404-409, especially 407, are unreliable. See D. N. Dumville's response: 'Motes and Beams: Two Insular Computistical Manuscripts', *Peritia* 2 (1983) 248-56.

<sup>61</sup> A facsimile and a transcription of the acrostics are published in Lindsay, *Early Welsh Script*, pl. 5 (fol. 74v). On the authorship of the acrostics, see M. Lapidge, 'Some Latin Poems as Evidence for the Reign of Athelstan', *Anglo-Saxon England* 9 (1981) 61-98, especially 81-83.

<sup>62</sup> Cf. H. Sweet, *The Oldest English Texts* (EETS OS 83; London, 1885, rpt. 1938), p. 177. In his recent edition of the Old English Martyrology, G. Kotzor argues that the West-Saxon royal genealogy transmitted in Add. 23211 provides only a *terminus post quem* rather than evidence for dating the fragment. Kotzor bases his reasoning on London, British Library Add. 34652, a copy of the Old English Martyrology which, like Add. 23211, contains the West-Saxon royal genealogy to Alfred but was copied s. xi. Kotzor's reservations with regard to using the genealogy in Add. 23211 as evidence for the date of the fragment are not necessary. Palaeographically the fragment must fall within the approximate period of the late ninth century to the beginning of the tenth century. Within that context, therefore, the West-Saxon genealogy which stops at Alfred does allow us to define a little more precisely a date consistent with the palaeography. See G. Kotzor, *Das altenglische*

(4) Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 173, fols. 1r-16r (Anglo-Saxon Chronicle ['Parker Chronicle']).

On the basis of palaeographical, codicological, and linguistic evidence, M. B. Parkes has shown that the first 16 leaves of CCCC 173 were close to the original draft of the common recension of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, evidently completed c. 891; fols. 1r-16r, in the hand of Parkes's Scribe 1, were therefore copied after c. 891.<sup>63</sup> The evidence that the second scribe in CCCC 173, a female copyist at Nunnaminster active c. 912, continued the annals from 892 to 912 suggests that Scribe 1 completed his stint not much after 891.<sup>64</sup> Scribe 1 also supplied *lacunae* to the preface and text of Sedulius' *Carmen paschale* bound with the 'Parker Chronicle' (fols. 57r-79v) and added a note in the 'Book of Nunnaminster' (fol. 40v) on the bounds of Queen Ealhswith's land at Winchester.<sup>65</sup>

(5)-(6) London, British Library Cotton Tiberius B.xi + Kassel, Landesbibliothek Anhang 19 (Gregory, *Pastoral Care*); Oxford, Bodleian Library Hatton 20 (Gregory, *Pastoral Care*).

Ker noted that King Alfred's English translation of Gregory's *Cura pastoralis*, transmitted in the London-Kassel fragments, and in Hatton 20, provides both items with a *terminus post quem* of 890.<sup>66</sup> The memorandum on the dissemination of copies of Alfred's translation, which Wanley saw in Cotton Tiberius B.xi before it was burned in 1731, suggests that the surviving fragments and Hatton 20 were made before c. 897.

*Martyrologium* 1 (Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse. Abhandlungen, N. F. 88.1; Munich, 1981), pp. 43\*-55\*, especially p. 43\* n. 4 and pl. 1 (fol. 2r) [Add. 23211 = A in Kotzor's edition]. See also D. N. Dumville, 'The West Saxon Genealogical Regnal List: Manuscripts and Texts', *Anglia* 104 (1986) 1-32, especially 2-4, pl. on p. 3 (fol. 1v).

<sup>63</sup> Parkes, 'Palaeography of the Parker Manuscript', especially 153-54. Cf. Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*, nos. 39, 40. For an edition of the text see *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel*, ed. J. Earle and C. Plummer, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1892-99), rev. D. Whitelock (Oxford, 1972). A semi-diplomatic edition of CCCC 173 has been published: *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition*, vol. 3: *MS A*, ed. J. Bately (Cambridge, 1986) with 1 pl. (opposite title-page; fol. 1r). For the complete facsimile of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle in CCCC 173 (fols. 1r-56v), see *The Parker Chronicle and Laws (Corpus Christi College, MS. 173). A Facsimile*, ed. R. Flower and H. Smith (EETS OS 208; London, 1941 and rpt. Oxford, 1973).

<sup>64</sup> On the date and place at which Scribe 2 wrote, see Parkes, *ibid.*, especially 150, 154 and 'A Fragment of an Early-Tenth-Century Anglo-Saxon Manuscript and Its Significance', *Anglo-Saxon England* 12 (1983) 129-40, especially 132.

<sup>65</sup> For the additions of Scribe 1 to Sedulius' *Carmen paschale*, see Parkes, 'Palaeography of the Parker Manuscript', especially 156 and pl. 5 (fol. 57r); cf. Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*, no. 40. For the additions of Scribe 1 to the 'Book of Nunnaminster', see Parkes, 'A Fragment of an Early-Tenth-Century Anglo-Saxon Manuscript', especially 131 and pl. 3b (fol. 40v).

<sup>66</sup> Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*, nos. 195, 324. The complete facsimile of Cotton Tiberius B.xi, Anhang 19, and Hatton 20 were published in *The Pastoral Care. King Alfred's Translation of St. Gregory's Regula Pastoralis*, ed. N. R. Ker (Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile 6; Copenhagen, 1956). On the text see D. Horgan, 'The Relationship between the O. E. mss. of King Alfred's Translation of Gregory's *Pastoral Care*', *Anglia* 91 (1973) 153-69.

B. *Palaeographical features of dated insular manuscripts (s. IX<sup>2</sup>)*

The clearest sign that some manuscripts copied late in the ninth century drew directly on traditions which were current between 800 and 850 is the strict regard which CCCC 173, the London-Kassel fragments, and Hatton 20 still have for the vertical lines of layout. Otherwise the palaeographical features which the late manuscripts share with the early ones are vestigial and interesting not so much for their attenuated appearance as for the evidence which they provide of what had been pared down, eliminated or lost from earlier conventions. Traces of the mannerisms popular before 850 are still evident in the later codices in such features as the finials which may adorn letters like *g*, *l*, *m*, *p*, *r*, *s*, and *t*, or in the non-functional loop in the letter *h* when a *littera notabilior* in CCCC 173, or in the deliberate articulation of letters which could have been coalesced in ligature. However, such mannerisms are by no means as overwhelmingly present in the later script, and their curtailment gives the general impression that the handwriting has been purged of much of its earlier fussiness.

The deployment of the insular grades is also conspicuously rare in the late ninth-century manuscripts. The graphs with which the so-called Preface to the vernacular *Cura pastoralis* opens in Hatton 20 perhaps come closest to testifying to the use of the insular grades, though what we find here is vastly limited and somewhat old-fashioned by early ninth-century standards.<sup>67</sup> Thus the text of the 'Preface' begins with Alfred's name, of which the first syllable is written in square capitals and the second in letters of diminishing size which approximate the form of those in the text minuscule but include an uncial *R*. The movement from square capitals to text minuscule is accomplished in Hatton 20 within the space of one word through the use of 'diminuendo'; such a transition would have taken early ninth-century scribes through multiple grades of insular script and several lines or pages of vellum. Interestingly, the famous inscription, identifying Worcester as the destination of the manuscript and evidently added above the 'Preface' after that text had been copied, lends no graphic variation to the head of the page but is written in the same square capitals as those in the first syllable of Alfred's name.<sup>68</sup> The opening to the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle in CCCC 173 offers other instructive evidence which suggests that the scribe who wrote the display in that manuscript was turning to other traditions for his inspiration. Thus we find that the first line of the text in the Corpus manuscript contains seven words in calligraphic square capitals and the first two syllables of the next word in letters which are essentially uncial. The second line of the Chronicle is written in the text minuscule. The

<sup>67</sup> See Ker, *Pastoral Care* (Hatton 20, fol. 1r).

<sup>68</sup> Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*, no. 324.

immediate transition to the text minuscule from display capitals patterned after antique models is suggestive of Carolingian rather than insular practice.<sup>69</sup>

Another indication that late ninth-century scribes no longer concerned themselves with the hierarchy of insular grades is provided by the occurrence of such letters as the **oc** form of **a** and uncial **R** and **S** as variant graphs within the text minuscule. In the early ninth century, such variant letters were common in the higher grades of minuscule, like hybrid and set, but were avoided in cursive minuscule, the equivalent in formality to the text minuscule of the late ninth-century books.<sup>70</sup> Clearly some late scribes were worried about the proliferation of graphs deemed acceptable for a letter in text minuscule because the copyists of CCCC 173, under Carolingian influence from Rheims, deliberately eliminated from their text minuscule the formal variants for **a** and **s**, as well as underslung **l**, cursive ligatures, and subscript letters.<sup>71</sup> This process of elimination, whose first tentative signs appear in the work of Scribe 1, is manifestly adopted by Scribe 2 during the course of her stint *c.* 912, and has been accomplished by the time that Scribe 3, also writing at Nunnaminster, makes her contribution to CCCC 173 *c.* 925.<sup>72</sup>

The proportions which letters had in cursive minuscule in the early ninth century have undergone obvious change in the text minuscule of the late ninth century. The early graphs, distinctive because they are horizontally compressed and have elongated ascenders and descenders and pointed arches, give way to letters which are square in shape and occupy more lateral space. Ascenders and descenders are comparatively shorter; pointed arches are flattened. A resulting graph which shows the change in proportions most clearly is the square **a**, a defining characteristic of the evolving 'square minuscule' which becomes standard during the course of the tenth century; other significant letters are **m**, **n**, and **r**.<sup>73</sup> Most of the scribes represented in the late ninth-century manuscripts which can be dated write a minuscule that is decidedly square though lacking the maturity and definition of the scriptorium type perfected at Nunnaminster by Scribes 2 and 3 of CCCC 173. Among the late ninth-century scribes, the two main hands at work in Hatton 20 are somewhat exceptional because they effect a convincing synthesis of pointed and square properties in the most developed examples of their handwriting.<sup>74</sup> Digby 63,

<sup>69</sup> See Flower and Smith, *Parker Chronicle* (fol. 1a) and Parkes, 'Palaeography of the Parker Manuscript', 159-61.

<sup>70</sup> Brown, 'Irish Element', 101.

<sup>71</sup> Parkes, 'Palaeography of the Parker Manuscript', especially 158-59, 163.

<sup>72</sup> Parkes, *ibid.*, especially 150, 154, 158-59; on the affiliation of Scribe 3 with Nunnaminster see Parkes, 'A Fragment of an Early-Tenth-Century Anglo-Saxon Manuscript', 132.

<sup>73</sup> On early Anglo-Saxon square minuscule, see: Parkes, 'Palaeography of the Parker Manuscript', especially 158; T. A. M. Bishop, 'An Early Example of the Square Minuscule', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 4 (1964-68) 246-52, pls. 18-19 and 'The Corpus Martianus Capella', *ibid.*, 257-75, especially 257-58.

<sup>74</sup> On the two main hands in Hatton 20, see Ker, *Pastoral Care*, pp. 19-21.



the only item of northern origin, is also remarkable because its handwriting, amply spaced horizontally, contains graphs for **a**, **r** and **s** which are strongly suggestive of these letters in Carolingian minuscule.

C. *Insular manuscripts attributable to s. ix<sup>2</sup> on palaeographical grounds*

Two otherwise undated items of insular origin may be attributed to the late ninth century on the basis of their palaeography. They are:

- (1) London, British Library Add. 40165A, fols. 6-7 (Old English Martyrology).

The handwriting of this fragment shows some of the proportions of square minuscule, but square **a** occurs regularly only after **t**; this restricted use of square **a** suggests that the fragment is an early example of square minuscule.<sup>75</sup> Although it is more primitive, the handwriting of Add. 40165A perhaps resembles that of CCCC 173 most closely and would seem to be contemporary with it.

- (2) London, British Library Royal 5.F.iii (Aldhelm, *De laude virginitatis*).

Royal 5.F.iii is an interesting manuscript palaeographically because the different scribes who wrote it were all so obviously at the transitional phase in insular book production to which the dated late ninth-century manuscripts testify. The layout of the Royal Aldhelm, with its *litterae notabiliores* set off from the text in a vertical column to the left, is in the tradition of the early ninth-century codices.<sup>76</sup> The handwriting of some of the scribes in the codex is notably square in its proportions and letter forms; the work of other copyists grafts the proportions and letters of square minuscule onto cursive pointed minuscule. Graphs may still exhibit mannerisms. Display script, though confined to one line of space, may make vestigial use of the insular grades. Uncial **R** and **S** are variant letters in the text minuscule. The transitional quality of Royal 5.F.iii and some examples of its display are reminiscent in a general way of what we find in the handwriting of the two main scribes in Hatton 20. It seems likely, then, that the Royal Aldhelm is contemporary with Hatton 20.

<sup>75</sup> Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*, no. 132. Facsimiles: Kotzor, *Das altenglische Martyrologium* 1, pp. 109\*-17\* and pl. 8 (fol. 7r) [Add. 40165A = E in Kotzor's edition]; *New Palaeographical Society* (1913-30) 1, pl. 102a-b (fols. 6v, 7).

<sup>76</sup> Facsimiles: E. Temple, *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: 900-1066* (London, 1976), no. 2, ills. 5, 6, 9 (fol. 6v, 32v, 2v); *Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Old Royal and King's Collections* 1, under shelf mark and 4, pl. 44 (fols. 2v, 6v, 37v). On the ornament and script in Royal 5.F.iii, see Brown, *Durham Ritual*, pp. 38-39. On the leaf ornament see F. Wormald, 'Decorated Initials in English mss. from A.D. 900-1100', *Archaeologia* 91 (1945) 107-35, especially 114 n. 1. Royal 5.F.iii = R<sup>1</sup> in Ehwald, *Aldhelmi opera*, pp. 209-323, especially pp. 218-25.

D. *Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 307 (Vita sancti Guthlaci)*

Plate 9 The point of departure for this study of insular manuscripts was the border period between the eighth and ninth centuries into which Lowe had felt compelled to place a number of codices. I confront the same problem at the other end of the century in the final manuscript whose date I examine now. CCCC 307 was considered ninth century by M. R. James (following Bradshaw) and B. Colgrave.<sup>77</sup> Neither James nor Colgrave gave reasons for this date, nor did they attempt to offer any reckoning more specific than the broad span of a century. An acrostic, added by a second hand at the end of the *Vita*, contains one example of a Caroline g. This implies that the acrostic cannot have been added much before the middle years of the tenth century and thus the acrostic provides a *terminus ante quem* for the manuscript.<sup>78</sup> CCCC 307 does not use square a, and its handwriting is not comparable to the square minuscule used by Scribe 2 of CCCC 173 c. 912. The confident use which the Corpus Guthlac makes of austere, simplified graphs, well spaced on the horizontal line, and heavy antique display and *litterae notabiliores* indicates that its handwriting has been influenced by changes evident in late ninth-century books. At the same time, the Corpus Guthlac is not close in palaeographical detail to any item which we can place between c. 850 and 900. The evidence suggests that CCCC 307 should probably be regarded as s. x in.

\*  
\* \*

The comparison of palaeographical features in early and late ninth-century manuscripts copied in England indicates that traditions in book production changed after c. 850. Elsewhere I have accounted for this by suggesting that book production was depressed in the third quarter of the ninth century for historical reasons.<sup>79</sup> The decline in the copying of manuscripts meant a loss of opportunity to practise and thus maintain habits which had been established in the writing and laying out of texts. When book production revived in about the last quarter of the ninth century, the esthetic which we find operating no longer encourages the use of the hierarchy of insular grades, mannered script, or a cursive minuscule which is laterally compressed. Instead these features are modified or replaced by a

<sup>77</sup> M. R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Corpus Christi College Cambridge*, 2 vols. and index to vol. 1 (Cambridge, 1912), 2, under shelf mark; B. Colgrave, *Felix's Life of Saint Guthlac* (Cambridge, 1956), pp. 26-27. CCCC 307 = C<sub>1</sub> in Colgrave's edition.

<sup>78</sup> On Carolingian minuscule in England, see T. A. M. Bishop, *English Caroline Minuscule* (Oxford, 1971).

<sup>79</sup> J. Morrish, 'King Alfred's Letter as a Source on Learning in England in the Ninth Century' in *Studies in Earlier Old English Prose*, ed. P. E. Szarmach (Albany, N. Y., 1986), pp. 87-107, especially pp. 100-101, and *An Examination of Literacy*, pp. 180-86.

preference for display modelled after the capitals of antiquity and by a text script whose letters are drawn out horizontally and are consequently square in proportion. Letters are simplified with respect to ornamentation and in some cases variant forms are eschewed. The changes apparent in late ninth-century insular manuscripts thus provide early signs of the attempt made by English copyists to impose features, drawn from Carolingian traditions, onto a graphic base which was native, an undertaking whose success is fully realized in the square minuscule written at Nunnaminster early in the tenth century.

## APPENDIX

*Dated and datable manuscripts copied in England during s. ix*

Berne, Burgerbibliothek 671 (Gospels), s. ix<sup>1</sup>.

Cambridge, University Library Add. 3330 + London, British Library Add. 50483K + Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum Ludwig XI 5 (olim William Merton Collection 41) + New Haven, Yale University, Beinecke Library 401 (olim Phillipps 8071) + 401A (olim Phillipps 20688, fols. 9-10) + Oxford, Bodleian Library Don. f. 458 + Lat. th. d. 24 + Philadelphia, Free Library Lewis ET 121 (Aldhelm, *De laude virginitatis*), s. ix in.

Cambridge, University Library Ll.1.10, fols. 2r-99v ('Book of Cerne'), c. 818-830.

———, Corpus Christi College 144 ('Corpus Glossary'), s. ix<sup>1</sup>.

———, Corpus Christi College 173, fols. 1r-16r (Anglo-Saxon Chronicle ['Parker Chronicle']), c. 891.

London, British Library Add. 23211, fols. 1-2 (computus, royal genealogies, Old English Martyrology), c. 871-899.

———, British Library Add. 40165A, fols. 6-7 (Old English Martyrology), s. ix ex.

———, British Library Cotton Domitian vii, fols. 15r-45r ('Liber vitae' of Durham), c. 840.

———, British Library Cotton Tiberius B.xi + Kassel, Landesbibliothek Anhang 19 (Gregory, *Pastoral Care*), c. 891-897.

———, British Library Cotton Tiberius C.ii (Bede, *Historia ecclesiastica*), s. ix<sup>1</sup>.

———, British Library Cotton Vespasian B.vi, fols. 104-109 (metrical calendar, royal genealogies, episcopal lists, etc.), c. 812.

———, British Library Harley 2965 ('Book of Nunnaminster'), s. ix<sup>1</sup>.

———, British Library Harley 7653 (prayers), s. viii-ix or s. ix in.

———, British Library Royal 1.E.vi + Oxford, Bodleian Library Lat. bib. b. 2 (P) + Canterbury, Cathedral Library Add. 16 (Gospels, Acts), s. ix med.

———, British Library Royal 2.A.xx (prayers), s. ix<sup>1</sup>.

———, British Library Royal 5.F.iii (Aldhelm, *De laude virginitatis*), s. ix ex.

Oxford, Bodleian Library Bodley 426, fols. 1r-118v (Philippus, *Expositio in Iob*), c. 838-847.

———, Bodleian Library Digby 63 (computus), c. 867-892.

———, Bodleian Library Hatton 20 (Gregory, *Pastoral Care*), c. 890-897.

———, Bodleian Library Hatton 93 (*Expositio missae* ['Primum in ordine']), s. ix<sup>l</sup>.

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 10861 (*Vitae sanctorum*), s. ix<sup>l</sup>.

Salisbury, Cathedral Library 117, fols. 163-164 + Oxford, Bodleian Library Lat. bib. c. 8 (P) + Tokyo, Private Collection (olim Geneva, Martin Bodmer Collection S. N.; Phillippus 36183) (Num 27:22-28:25; Dt 24:4-25:10, 31:9-32:6, 32:12-34:12), s. ix<sup>l</sup>.

Private Collection. A biblical fragment in the Doheny Collection was sold at Christie's (London) 2 December 1987, lot 137, and is now in a private collection in Tokyo. The fragment, which I have not seen, contains part of Judges; it is considered ninth century and insular in origin. I am indebted to Mrs. M. P. Brown for this information; see her article, 'The Reconstruction of a Lost Southumbrian Bible: An Exercise in "l'Archéologie du Livre"', *Anglo-Saxon England* 18 (1989), forthcoming.

## ARMCHAIR PILGRIMS: AMPULLAE FROM APHRODISIAS IN CARIA\*

*Sheila D. Campbell*

MANY objects of popular piety such as pilgrim flasks, pectoral crosses, reliquary crosses have been found at Aphrodisias in Caria. The items under consideration in this study are twelve terra cotta pilgrim flasks. Such flasks, also known as ampullae and eulogia, have been found in many locations throughout the Mediterranean and Europe. They may be made of silver, lead, terra cotta, glass or stone. There are two main types. The Egyptian ampullae have distinct handles, and frequently have inscriptions as part of the mould. The Asia Minor type ampullae do not have separate handles. Instead they have pierced holes simulating handles in the shoulders of the vessels. They rarely have inscriptions, but if so, they are incised, and not part of the mould. Pilgrim flasks begin to appear in the sixth century. They contained water or oil sanctified by contact with relics or holy locations. St. John Chrysostom tells us<sup>1</sup> that these objects bestowed a blessing, or eulogia, on the owner and provided assurance for a safe homeward journey. Indeed several of the metal ampullae from Monza and Bobbio<sup>2</sup> bear such inscriptions as 'Oil of the Tree of Life from the Holy Places of Christ', and 'Blessing of the Lord from the Holy Places of Christ'. It is generally believed that the iconography on the flasks relates them to specific sites, and that this would also be the site of manufacture. However, these sites of manufacture have not yet been identified and the iconography frequently cannot be localized. This problem will be discussed further below.

A large group of ampullae in the Louvre constitutes the largest published collection.<sup>3</sup> However, most of these were acquired by that institution from private collections, and not from controlled excavations. Other published examples from excavations usually consist of one or two items only. The following series,

\* I am grateful to Professor Kenan T. Erim (New York University), director of the excavations at Aphrodisias, for permission to publish this group of objects.

<sup>1</sup> John Chrysostom, *In martyres homilia* (PG 50.664).

<sup>2</sup> André Grabar, *Les ampoules de Terre Sainte* (Paris, 1958), *passim*.

<sup>3</sup> Catherine Metzger, *Les ampoules à eulogie du Musée du Louvre* (Paris, 1981).

therefore, found at Aphrodisias in Caria constitutes a larger than usual grouping of ampullae from one known location. In general, pilgrim flasks are thought to begin to appear in the sixth century. Because they are such portable objects, and because they are often known only from public or private collections rather than dated excavation contexts, it is not possible to establish a precise chronology as yet. Nor are there any apparent inherent criteria within the objects themselves by means of which one could refine the dating. As will be seen from the following group, all of which are of the Asia Minor type, even those found in the course of scientific excavation often do not have a firm contextual dating.

1. Pilgrim flask — terra cotta (Fig. 1a-b).

7.2 × 5.2 cm.

Red to buff micaceous clay. Traces of poorly applied red glaze.

Find spot: Tomb east of the Temple of Aphrodite, North Temenos, found together with clay lamps of the fifth-century type. Trench C. Inv. 79/21/564 67/9.

*Side A.* A frontal male figure stands under a small arch decorated with transverse lines. He has short hair, indicated by a few little strokes, and a very full beard. The eyes are large round indented circles while the mouth and nose are drawn with a single short horizontal line. He appears to wear a cloak over a long tunic and against his left shoulder he holds a small round object decorated with circles arranged in a cruciform design. As with all other examples of this design it is impossible to identify this figure as a particular saint or evangelist. The use of an archway to enhance a figure is an artistic device of great antiquity and the very crude form of the arch in this example cannot provide any further clues to the identity of the figure.

*Side B.* A standing figure possibly female, holding something on the left arm. She (?) wears a long garment and hiplength mantle. She either has a very full hair style or she wears a veil or mantle on her head. The object held in the left arm is indistinguishable in any of the Louvre examples, as is the case here also. It is tempting to suggest that this is Mary holding the Christ child. However, the relief is too worn to be easily read. Two similar examples in the Louvre (Metzger nos. 107, 110) show what could be seen as female figures. Indeed the Aphrodisias example shows traces of the pattern of circles around the figure seen on Louvre no. 107.

Several similar examples in the Louvre, nos. 104, 106-112, are all described as coming from the region of Smyrna (Izmir).

2. Pilgrim flask — terra cotta (Fig. 2).

5.5 × 4.3 cm.

Soft micaceous red-brown clay. Traces of matt-red glaze.

Find spot: West necropolis, central chamber Tomb 1. Inv. 63-299.

Only one half of the flask remains. The design seems to be the same as in no. 1, namely, a frontal standing male figure in an archway, who is holding a round object. The surface is very abraded but the similarity to no. 1 is obvious. The same comparisons from the Louvre group apply here.

## 3. Pilgrim flask — terra cotta (Fig. 3a-c).

6.8 × 6 cm.

Buff micaceous clay. Traces of red glaze or slip.

Find spot: Trench B, east end of North Temenos House just at level of the *opus sectile* floor. This floor has been dated to the late fourth century (publication in preparation). Inv. 67-70.

*Side A.* A frontal standing male figure flanked by palm branches. Part of the head is lost but it is clear that he had hair shown low on the forehead. The one remaining eye is a deeply incised point. The nose is thick, the mouth a thin line. He has a long pointed beard. He wears a full-length garment, the folds of which are indicated by multiple lines. There are two double circles approximately in the area of the knees. On similar examples in the Louvre Metzger (nos. 113-115) has identified these as *orbiculi*. Segmenta (square) and orbiculi (round) are decorated patches of cloth which were applied to garments, usually at the shoulder and knee levels. It was a custom which became fashionable from the fourth century onward, but may be found as early as the first century.<sup>4</sup> In front of his chest he holds a book decorated with a large diagonal cross. The figure is cut off just below knee level in this and in the Louvre example (Metzger no. 113).

*Side B.* This side is badly damaged but enough remains to identify the scene as a figure seated on a folding chair, in front of a book on a table or desk, as in the Louvre example (Metzger no. 115). The right shoulder and lower legs remain, as well as the lower part of the chair. The head and arms are lost but we may confidently reconstruct this as a seated evangelist writing in a book on his lap. Precisely which evangelist this represents is unknown. It is also not known whether this is intended to be the same person as the one shown on the other side (cf. Metzger nos. 113-114). A flask with the same iconography on the two sides was found at Sardis,<sup>5</sup> and yet another example has been found in the excavations at Antioch.<sup>6</sup>

## 4. Pilgrim flask — terra cotta (Fig. 4a-b).

6.8 × 5.7 cm.

Pinkish-red micaceous clay.

Find spot: Stadium I, stratum III B, an undated context. Inv. 79/21/565; 68/162.

*Side A.* A standing male figure, dressed in a short tunic and cloak, stands on the body of a dragon. His clothing resembles the uniform of a Roman soldier. His head is disproportionately large with coarse rudimentary features, curly hair and a short beard. His left hand is placed on his hip while the right holds a short barbed spear with which he pierces the head of the dragon. The beast has ears and an open mouth. The body extends below the figure of the man and up the other side of this surface to fill in that space with the coils of the tail. This figure may be identified as St. George or St. Demetrius as both are shown

<sup>4</sup> Doro Levi, *Antioch Mosaic Pavements* (Princeton, 1947), p. 49.

<sup>5</sup> G. M. A. Hanfmann, 'Eighth Campaign at Sardis 1968', *Bulletin of the American School of Oriental Research* 182 (1965) 16-17, figs. 12-13.

<sup>6</sup> R. P. Griffing, Jr., 'An Early Christian Ivory Plaque in Cyprus and Notes on the Asiatic Ampullae', *Art Bulletin* 20 (1938) figs. 16-17.

killing a dragon. Similarly Daniel, who is shown on the other side, can also be shown killing a dragon<sup>7</sup> but in that legend he destroys the snake, or dragon, by means of a cake.<sup>8</sup> The weapon here, however, is clearly a spear.

*Side B.* The central figure wears a long garment with short sleeves. He holds a book in his right hand in front of his chest. The book is decorated with a large diagonal cross. He too has a very large head with very simple features and a beard. His mouth is open as if he were speaking. On either side of him is an abbreviated version of an amiable lion, showing a heavily maned head and a long prominent tail. Most of the bodies of the two lions is not depicted. The iconography of Daniel with the lions usually shows him in the orans position, not holding a book. However, since most of the stories of Daniel emphasize his wit and wisdom, the book is an appropriate attribute. This same iconography occurs in the Louvre example (Metzger no. 117), reported to be from the Izmir region.

5. Pilgrim flask — terra cotta (Fig. 5a-b).

6.5 × 2.3 cm.

Pinkish-buff micaceous clay.

Find spot unknown. Inv. 76-752; 83/15/3726.

*Side A.* The left half of one side remains and a small fragment of the other side. However, there is enough to identify it as the same type as no. 4. There is a male figure standing frontally, dressed in a short tunic and cloak. He has curly hair and a short beard. In his right hand he holds a short barbed spear which is aimed at the head of a beast, no doubt a dragon as in no. 4.

*Side B.* Shows a head which extends up into the neck of the ampulla as in no. 4, and on the right the tail of an animal. The rest is lost, but it presumably showed a scene similar to side B of no. 4.

6. Pilgrim flask — terra cotta (Fig. 6a-b).

6.9 × 5.4 cm.

Pink-orange micaceous clay.

Find spot unknown. Inv. 74-252; 79/21/563.

*Side A.* A striated arch is set on spiral columns with 'Ionic' capitals. At the two points of the springing of the arch and at the top there are knobs which presumably represent acroteria. Inside the arch is a scallop shell (not visible here) and a doorway set above four steps. The decorated double doors are slightly open and a male figure can be seen emerging. He is dressed in a full-length garment and holds a book decorated with a cross. The identification of this scene is unclear. The newly risen Lazarus is usually shown emerging from the tomb, wrapped in a mummy-like shroud, and certainly not carrying a book. The tomb of Christ is usually shown empty, to emphasize the resurrection. Thus the identity of this figure remains unknown. The same iconography may be seen on a flask in Berlin.<sup>9</sup> The provenance of this flask is not given.

<sup>7</sup> See O. M. Dalton, *Early Christian Antiquities in the British Museum* (London, 1921), p. 185.

<sup>8</sup> (Apoc.) *Daniel, Bel and the Snake* 27.

<sup>9</sup> Griffing, 'Asiatic Ampullae', fig. 21.



*Side B.* A cross on a round altar is set in a banded arch with spiral columns, and Ionic capitals. It is similar to Metzger nos. 120, 121, but there is no indentation in the centre of the cross. A flattened area can be seen on the side of the altar and part of the right-hand Ionic column. This seems to be merely a case of careless handling. After shaping in the mould the piece was placed face down before the clay had completely dried.

7. Pilgrim flask — terra cotta (Fig. 7a-b).

7 × 5.2 cm.

Buff micaceous clay. Traces of poorly applied red glaze.

Find spot: Tomb east of the Temple of Aphrodite — North Temenos. Trench C. Found together with clay lamps of the fifth-century type. Inv. 7-96.

*Side A/B.* Both sides are the same. Two palm branches flank an arch decorated with striations. Inside the arch is a cross surrounded by a series of punched circles. Another circle is placed at the junction of the two arms of the cross. The space below the arch and the palms is filled with a series of radiating lines like a scallop shell. The flask has been broken and mended, but there is still a piece missing on one side and edge. This type is not represented in the Louvre collection. However, all of these elements — the cross, the arch, palm branches, punched circles, the scallop shell — occur in varying combinations on other ampullae.

8. Pilgrim flask — terra cotta (Fig. 8a-b).

3.5 × 3.5 cm.

Red micaceous clay.

Find spot: Stadium I, stratum IV B/C, at a depth of 3.43 m, near floor level but in an undated context. Inv. 68-164.

*Side A/B.* The decoration is the same on both sides consisting of an incised cross in a circle. The space between the cross and the circle holds a small circle in each of the four quadrants. A very similar example is seen in Metzger no. 142.

9. Pilgrim flask — terra cotta (Fig. 9a-b).

3.5 × 3.5 cm.

Red micaceous clay.

Find spot unknown. Inv. 67-276.

*Side A/B.* Both sides are the same. Part of one edge has been broken off. The decoration consists of two rings formed by recessed dots enclosing a plain circle and an incised cross with slightly flaring arms. The closest examples in the Louvre are nos. 140, 147.

10. Pilgrim flask — terra cotta (Fig. 10a-b).

3.5 × 3.0 cm.

Red micaceous clay.

Find spot unknown. Inv. 62-65.

*Side A/B.* Both sides have the same decoration but one is more abraded than the other. The pattern consists of an equal armed cross inside a ring with a series of dots. Two very similar examples are seen in the Louvre (Metzger nos. 134, 145).

11. Pilgrim flask — terra cotta (Fig. 11a-b).

7 × 5 cm.

Micaceous reddish-brown clay, gray at core. Matt-red to brown-black glaze exterior and over into interior lip.

Find spot: West necropolis, central chamber Tomb I. Inv. 63-345.

*Side A/B.* The decoration consists of inscribed circles. The back is mostly lost, but was probably the same design. This type is not represented in the Louvre collection. However, a flask with very similar but not identical decoration is in Berlin and reported to be from Alexandria.<sup>10</sup>

12. Pilgrim flask — terra cotta (Fig. 12a-b).

4.5 × 3.5 cm.

Red micaceous clay.

Find spot unknown. Inv. no. unknown.

*Side A/B.* Both sides are the same, although one side is more abraded than the other. The flask is very small, and the handles are not pierced. The decoration, although now very worn, originally represented a scallop shell. For a similar, more legible version of this see Metzger nos. 152-155.

In studying this group of ampullae, it quickly becomes apparent that ten of the twelve have close parallels, often in several examples, in the Louvre collection. Of the ten, two forms are represented twice at Aphrodisias. This gives us eight iconographical types, in multiple examples, of which all but one are said to have come from the region of Smyrna (modern Izmir). The one exception is from Ephesus. Thus we have a grouping of eight iconographical types within a limited geographical region (see map, fig. 13). A pilgrim flask found in Sardis<sup>11</sup> is the same type as no. 114 in the Louvre, also reported to be from Izmir. But can we fix these types to any location? The 'holy sites' of this area are Ephesus for the travels and imprisonment of St. Paul and the tomb of John the Evangelist, plus the Cave of the Seven Sleepers and the House of the Virgin Mary, both outside Ephesus. The iconography on the flasks is not particularly appropriate to these locations. Nor is it likely that the group of approximately twenty-nine objects (twelve from Aphrodisias, one from Sardis, one from Ephesus, fifteen or more in the Louvre) could represent the souvenirs of returning pilgrims who lived in this region of Asia Minor. The coincidence is just too great that they would all have visited exactly the same sites and have brought home the same selection of ampullae.

I suggest instead that these ampullae represent the wares of travelling peddlers of objects of popular piety. People who never left home could purchase such objects in the belief that they came from or represented particular shrines and holy

<sup>10</sup> *ibid.*, fig. 22.

<sup>11</sup> Hanfmann, 'Eighth Campaign', 16-17, figs. 12-13.

places, and the purchasers could then benefit from the sanctified oil or water contained therein. The fact that many of the early accounts tell us that people acquired eulogia, or a blessing, in the form of tokens and flasks at the sites which they visited does not rule out the possibility of a secondary market. The generic or non-specific nature of the iconography allows for a multiplicity of interpretations; it would be to the advantage of the seller who could then identify the image of a male figure holding a book with a cross on it as whichever saint or holy personage the purchaser requested. This would account for the fact that inscriptions on Asia Minor ampullae are usually added later. As a further argument that these flasks need not be associated with a particular site, we should note that the flasks which show St. Thekla are often combined with St. Menas and are usually of the Egyptian type. Yet the actual shrine of St. Thekla (Ayatekla) is in Cilicia, in southern Asia Minor. The idea that an owner did not necessarily visit the holy site from which a flask was purported to have come does not reduce the belief in the efficacy of the flask and its contents. Many of these objects have been found in tomb contexts and Aphrodisias is no exception. Those who were unable to go on pilgrimage could content themselves with being 'armchair pilgrims' and still obtain some of the benefits by acquiring the flasks. Certainly they were sufficiently important to be buried with the owner in many cases.

This theory of travelling merchants who dealt in items of popular piety is of course impossible to prove given current archaeological knowledge. So far a site of manufacture has not been found. Nor has anyone discovered a cache of flasks which could be the stock of such a merchant. A small group of pilgrim flasks was found in the excavations at Antioch, in domestic and funerary contexts. One of these has been published, and it is the same as no. 3 of the Aphrodisias series. Other examples from Antioch are as yet unpublished, but are currently being studied. Perhaps the results of that study will also support the suggestion of 'armchair pilgrims'.

A GREEK SLAVE IN MAJORCA  
IN 1419-26:  
NEW DOCUMENTS\*

*J. N. Hillgarth*

IN his many works on the subject and especially in his fundamental *L'esclavage dans l'Europe médiévale*, Charles Verlinden has stressed the crucial role of slavery in the economy of certain Mediterranean lands such as Cyprus and Majorca, where an insular situation made the flight of slaves more difficult.<sup>1</sup> Meanwhile the local study of slavery in Majorca has greatly advanced, especially through the research of the former Director of the Archivo Histórico del Reino de Mallorca, Francisco Sevillano Colom (d. 1976). It was Dr. Sevillano who provided Professor Verlinden with new documents on the subject and especially with a taxation list of 1428.<sup>2</sup> This list records 1,078 male slaves outside the City of Majorca (Palma today). The figure is lower than the 2,800 'catius' ('captiffs') documented outside the City exactly a century earlier, in 1328.<sup>3</sup>

Both figures are no doubt underestimates. In the case of 1428 we have to reckon with the extreme probability that many owners did not declare their slaves so as to avoid paying a new and heavier tax of 12 s. per slave that would be levied on them. Both the list of 1328 and that of 1428 omit all slaves in the City and all female slaves in the island. Using comparative figures, Verlinden estimates that in 1428 there were 8,082 slaves of both sexes in Majorca as a whole.<sup>4</sup> While we have

\* The following abbreviations are used: ARM = Archivo Histórico del Reino de Mallorca (Palma); BSAL = *Bolletí de la Societat Arqueològica Luliana* (Palma, 1885-).

<sup>1</sup> Charles Verlinden, *L'esclavage dans l'Europe médiévale*, 2 vols. (Rijksuniversiteit te Gent, Werken uitgegeven door de Faculteit van de Letteren en Wijsbegeerte 119, 162; Ghent-Bruges, 1955-77): see 2.356. See also his article, 'La esclavitud en la economía medieval de las Baleares, principalmente en Mallorca', *Cuadernos de historia de España* 67-68 (1982) 123-64.

<sup>2</sup> The same documents appear in Charles Verlinden, 'Une taxation d'esclaves à Majorque en 1428 et la traite italienne', *Bulletin de l'Institut historique belge de Rome* 42 (1972) 141-87, and in Francisco Sevillano Colom, 'Demografía y esclavos del siglo xv en Mallorca', *BSAL* 34 (1973-75) 160-97. In both cases the transcription is Sevillano's.

<sup>3</sup> Verlinden, *ibid.*, 186 f.; Sevillano, *ibid.*, 197.

<sup>4</sup> Verlinden, *L'esclavage* 2.351.

no exact figures for the total population of the island one can arrive at approximate estimates by using the surviving tax registers. Thus Sevillano has calculated the Majorcan population at 42,695 in 1421 and at 40,540 in 1427.<sup>5</sup> Whether one takes Verlinden's hypothetical figure of 8,082 or Sevillano's lower estimate for rural slaves, it seems reasonable to suppose that in 1428 slaves constituted at least ten per cent of the total population of Majorca; they may have attained a much higher proportion than this.<sup>6</sup>

These figures would help to explain a series of measures adopted by the authorities. In 1374 a royal decree, stating that many proprietors owned sixty slaves or more, sought to diminish their number.<sup>7</sup> The same year — though possibly later than the date of this ordinance — a revolt by Tartar and Moorish slaves was put down with some difficulty.<sup>8</sup> In 1378 there followed two successive decrees prescribing a census of rural slaves; only a fragment of this census survives.<sup>9</sup> In 1462 and again in 1481, there were new attempts to restrict the number of Turkish slaves. This was a time when the expanding Ottoman power was felt as a major threat and a large number of Turkish slaves might well be perceived as a fifth column in the island.<sup>10</sup>

The danger the authorities saw in the large slave population did not only result in attempts to restrict its increase. In 1354 meetings of more than two or three slaves were prohibited. Rural slaves were to be chained up at night. Exceptions were made to these regulations and, in general, the severest measures were applied to Turks and Moors. Unlike 'Sarracens and other captives', Greek slaves could be transported by sea, though, even so, two Catalans had to be carried for each captive.<sup>11</sup>

Verlinden has taken great pains in establishing the origin of the slaves documented in Mediterranean Europe.<sup>12</sup> Up to 1453 many slaves came from the Genoese

<sup>5</sup> Sevillano, 'Demografía', 164.

<sup>6</sup> Sevillano, *ibid.*, 175 (ten per cent); Verlinden, *L'esclavage* 2.351 (almost eighteen per cent).

<sup>7</sup> Miguel Bonet, 'Orden disminuyendo el número de esclavos en Mallorca', *BSAL* 7 (1897-98) 359-60.

<sup>8</sup> On 7 October 1374 fourteen Muslims, Tartars, and 'neophyte' slaves were hanged, 'ex eo quia voluerunt ignem ponere per diversa loca dictae civitatis [Maioicarum] et terram ac regnum Maioicarum sibi ipsis retinere ac Regi Sarracenorum tradere' (Jaime Villanueva, *Viage literario a las iglesias de España*, 22 vols. [Madrid, 1802-52], 21.218). The royal ordinance referred to in n. 7 is dated 10 August.

<sup>9</sup> Verlinden, 'Une taxation', 185-86; Sevillano, 'Demografía', 196-97.

<sup>10</sup> Gabriel Ensenyat Pujol, 'Algunes mesures restrictives contra l'importació d'esclaus turcs a Mallorca (1462-1481)', *BSAL* 41 (1985) 199-206. See also the memorial of 1491 cited in n. 14 below.

<sup>11</sup> Verlinden, 'Une taxation', 183-85; Sevillano, 'Demografía', 194-95. See also the regulations of 1406, published by Antoni Pons, 'Capitols e ordinacions fetes per lo Offici de mestre de guaita', *BSAL* 21 (1926-27) 347-51.

<sup>12</sup> I draw here on the summary in my book, *The Spanish Kingdoms 1250-1516*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1976-78), 2.83-87.

colonies in the Crimea. Others were transported en masse by Venetian slave traders from Constantinople or the Aegean.<sup>13</sup> Tartars, Turks, Caucasians, Russians, Bulgars, Albanians and Bosnians appear in the records, as do Greeks and Sards (the last group enslaved as rebels against the Crown of Aragon, which, from 1343, included Majorca). After the fall of Constantinople to the Turks, Muslim slaves from North Africa tend to predominate. In the second half of the fifteenth century slaves from West Africa and the Canaries also appear. In 1491 a memorial of grievances advanced by the Majorcan authorities against the newly revived Inquisition includes the statement that the Inquisitors had freed hundreds of slaves belonging to Majorcans accused of Judaizing, 'which is total destruction of this kingdom, where, because of the sterility of the earth, all work has to be done by slaves.'<sup>14</sup> Documents from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries show that slavery long continued to be a fundamental part of the Majorcan economy.<sup>15</sup>

It has already become apparent that the fact that Greeks were Christians did not prevent their enslavement by Latin Catholics. The purchase by a Majorcan doctor of a Greek slave in Crete is documented as early as 1301. In the fourteenth century other Greek slaves were acquired by Catalans and Majorcans at Rhodes, in Sicily, and in Genoa.<sup>16</sup> Others may have been shipped directly from the Catalan duchies of Athens and Thebes while these existed (in 1311-88).<sup>17</sup> The many fourteenth-century contracts found in Majorcan archives that refer to Greek slaves in the island do not, in general, specify their place of origin.<sup>18</sup>

In the second half of this century a gradual reaction against the enslavement of Greeks begins to appear. While Pope Urban v (1362-70) was unable to secure the freedom of all Greek slaves by his general order on the subject, his decree, assisted by Byzantine diplomatic overtures and by large sums raised by Eastern Christian slaves, may have had some effect.<sup>19</sup> On one occasion the Crown of Aragon ordered

<sup>13</sup> Verlinden, *L'esclavage* 2.346-48, 352.

<sup>14</sup> Jordi Ventura, 'Els inicis de la Inquisició espanyola a Mallorca', *Randa* 5 (1977) 67-116, at 78: 'que es total perdicion de aquel reyno, en el qual por la sterelidat de la tierra todo el lavor se ha de fazer con esclavos.' The memorial goes on to note that most of these slaves come from North Africa and are only waiting for an opportunity to flee there. Since they know Majorca their presence in North Africa would constitute a special danger to the island.

<sup>15</sup> Pedro de Montaner Alonso, 'Aspectos de la esclavitud en Mallorca durante la Edad Moderna', *BSAL* 37 (1979-80) 289-328.

<sup>16</sup> Verlinden, *L'esclavage* 1.321-22 and 2.168, 171, 464.

<sup>17</sup> Antoni Rubió i Lluch, *Diplomatari de l'Orient català (1301-1409)*. *Col·lecció de documents per a la història de l'expedició catalana a Orient i dels ducats d'Atenes i Neopàtria* (Barcelona, 1947), pp. 173-75 (a document of 1329). See also Verlinden, *L'esclavage* 2.828 (a document of 1312).

<sup>18</sup> Verlinden, *L'esclavage* 1.327 (a document of 1352). Documents of 1361 and 1362 appear in Palma, Archivo de la Catedral XV, I, 11 (no foliation), citing 'Stives' (Thebes) and 'Romania' in general.

<sup>19</sup> Charles Verlinden, 'Orthodoxie et esclavage au bas moyen âge' in *Mélanges Eugène Tisserant* 5 (Studi e testi 235; Vatican City, 1964), pp. 427-40.

that individual Greeks from the Catalan duchies should be freed. This did not assist the subjects of other Eastern rulers. In 1401 Martin I of Aragon decreed that claims to liberty by Greeks who were originally from the Byzantine empire were not to be entertained.<sup>20</sup> There does appear, however, to be a perceptible change. In the fourteenth century many Greek slaves appear in Majorca. In 1343 they were at work on the new Gothic cathedral.<sup>21</sup> A confraternity of freed Greek slaves (presumably converts to the Latin rite) was established in the chapel of St. Nicholas in the cathedral. By 1460 this confraternity had ceased to exist and the chapel was transferred to a confraternity of Circassian former slaves.<sup>22</sup> In 1362 a list of slaves in the small town of Pollença contains a majority of sixty-nine Greeks, as compared with thirty-three others.<sup>23</sup> One does not find a similarly large group of Greeks in any one place in Majorca in the fifteenth century. Verlinden has noted the virtual absence of Greek slaves in Catalonia in the fifteenth century.<sup>24</sup> His view as to the sharp decline in their numbers and indeed virtual disappearance from the records of the Crown of Aragon is echoed, for Majorca, by Pierre Macaire in his recent thesis on Majorca as a trading centre from 1400 to 1450. Macaire's graph showing the nationality of the slaves recorded in notarial acts in the period contains hardly any Greeks.<sup>25</sup>

Greek slaves had not disappeared entirely, however. In 1419 an embassy from Byzantium appeared in Barcelona asking for the liberation of some fifty Greeks kidnapped by Catalan pirates in the Morea and sold in Sicily, some of whom, at least, had reached Catalonia.<sup>26</sup> The case recorded in the document published below shows that this act of piracy was not an isolated occurrence. It also reveals that the Venetian dominions in Greece continued to be as much open to attack by Catalans as were the territories of the Byzantine emperor. In the petition of 20 December 1425 reproduced below, Zan or Johan Dimitre ('in Majorca called Andrew') stated that he was a native of Patras or Neopatria, 'of the seigniory of the Lord Duke of Venice', the son of Michael Dimitre, a weaver (*texido*). Neopatria had been in Catalan hands from 1319 to 1390. After a period when it was held, first

<sup>20</sup> Verlinden, *L'esclavage* 1.328.

<sup>21</sup> Antoni Rubió y Lluch, *Documents per l'història de la cultura catalana mig-eva*, 2 vols. (Barcelona, 1908-21), 2.189.

<sup>22</sup> Rafael Juan, 'Cofradías de libertos de Mallorca', *BSAL* 34 (1973-75) 577-78.

<sup>23</sup> Mateo Rotger y Capllonch, *Historia de Pollença*, 3 vols. (Palma, 1897-1903), 1.109 f. See also the references to Greek slaves, including a boy aged three, 'killed at night by someone of the City', in the inventory of a bishop's goods made in 1363 (J. N. Hillgarth, 'Inventario de los bienes de Anthoni des Collell, obispo de Mallorca (1349-1363)', *BSAL* 31 [1958-59] 512, 537).

<sup>24</sup> Verlinden, 'Une taxation', 154.

<sup>25</sup> Pierre Macaire, *Majorque et le commerce international (1400-1450 environ)*, Thèse présentée devant l'Université de Paris IV-Sorbonne (Université de Lille III; Lille, 1986), pp. 119-20.

<sup>26</sup> Verlinden, *L'esclavage* 1.328. See also his 'Orthodoxie', 437-38.

by the Florentines and then by Turks, it had passed to the Venetians.<sup>27</sup> The fact that Venice, as Dimitre stated, was at peace with the 'Catalan Christian nation' did not prevent him being kidnapped by Catalan sailors at the port of Patras and carried off, together with other Greeks, to Sicily. Although Sicily was one of the main slave markets of the Mediterranean,<sup>28</sup> it was not possible to find buyers there ready to purchase Greek Christians. The captives had to be transferred to another ship belonging to a Valencian, Martí Xanxo (Sancho), and taken to Majorca, where they were sold in the coastal parish of Artà.<sup>29</sup>

Dimitre's petition does not state when these events occurred. However, other surviving documents reveal that it was on 21 September 1419 that Dimitre – already called in Majorca, as he says, Andrew – was sold to Miquel Rotlan for £ 80.<sup>30</sup> Twelve slaves (Greeks, Bosnians, Russians, and one Slav) were sold on the same day. The seller was Daniel de Sant Martí of Valencia, who was acting for Martí de Sa Coma of the same city (both of these names appear also in our documents). In every case the Majorcan merchant Antoni Castanyer acted as guarantor of the sale ('fideiussor et principalis responsor') and engaged to make it good against any objections that might be raised. Three of the twelve slaves in question were Greeks. One of them was sold to Joan Borrás, who (for obvious reasons of solidarity) appears in our documents as an associate and supporter of Dimitre's purchaser, Miquel Rotlan. The most interesting feature of the sale is the age of the slaves. 'Andreas', the youngest, was only fourteen.<sup>31</sup>

Artà, where Dimitre or 'Andrew' was sold, was one of the smaller towns and less thickly populated rural districts in Majorca. Relatively remote (it is 38 miles from the City of Majorca), its population in 1427 has been calculated at 1,055, which would make it the tenth most populous rural parish in the island. The proportion of slaves there was also relatively small. Using the 1428 list, Sevillano calculates it at 8.7 per cent of the local population, as compared with eleven other

<sup>27</sup> Kenneth M. Setton, *Catalan Domination of Athens 1311-1388* (Cambridge, Mass., 1948), pp. 29, 183; idem, *The Papacy and the Levant, 1204-1571*, 4 vols. (Philadelphia, 1976-84), 2.14, 32-35.

<sup>28</sup> Verlinden, *L'esclavage* 2.138-282.

<sup>29</sup> See the documents edited below.

<sup>30</sup> It is possible that Dimitre was given the name of Andrew to distinguish him from the large number of other Greek slaves called Dimitre. The list of 1362 from Pollença, already cited, mentions seven Dimitres, as compared with only one 'Andreu' (see Rotger, cited n. 23 above). Another of the three Greeks sold at Artà in 1419 was called 'Mitre' and so was a slave who appears in the 1428 list (see n. 42 below).

<sup>31</sup> ARM Protocolos, M-107, fols. 228r-246v. The sale of Dimitre appears on fol. 234r-v, where he is listed as 'quendam servum ... xiiii annorum vel circa nacionis grecorum vocatum Andreas.' These sale contracts are cited by Antoni Gili Ferrer, *Artà en el segle xv* (Mallorca, 1983), p. 217. Gili does not see that the 'Bossini' mentioned are Bosnians. He does not refer to the documents published here.



towns with over ten per cent (three with over twenty). The difference is due to the fact that Artà lay on the coast and, for reasons of security, the proportion of slaves documented in coastal areas was almost always smaller than in inland, mountainous regions from which flight was more difficult. Even in Pollença, where we have seen so many Greek slaves recorded in the fourteenth century, the proportion of slaves in 1428 to the total population was only seven per cent.<sup>32</sup> The situation of Artà near the coast also helps to explain the harsh local ordinance of 1402 which states that no person who had been a slave or a weekly labourer (*setmaner*) should receive any male or female slave in his house or allow them to eat, drink or sleep there. The penalty for breach of this decree was set at £ 1 on each occasion, or fifty blows, in case of inability to pay.<sup>33</sup> Other documents show that these regulations were enforced. In 1423 a former 'captive' was accused of sheltering slaves. If he continued to do so he was to be fined £ 5 or whipped instead.<sup>34</sup> The young Dimitre had not landed in an earthly paradise.

Since he was only fourteen in 1419, Dimitre could have been only twenty or twenty-one in 1425, at the time when he somehow contrived to get in touch with Johan Sora, a notary and 'procurator of poor and miserable persons', an office to which we shall return. It was Sora who enabled Dimitre to bring his appeal for freedom — on the grounds that he was a Greek Christian, born of free parents — to the court of the bailiff of Majorca in the capital of the island. Dimitre was fortunate in that he was young enough to have been able to acquire a knowledge of Majorcan (a far from easy language) in the six years he had spent as a slave in Artà, so that he could recount his case to Sora. His appeal dragged on from January to April 1426. On 10 April Dimitre's master, Rotlan, complained, through the notary Genis Mianes (the same notary who had drawn up the sale contracts of 1419) that he and his 'captive' had been obliged to spend six days in the City of Majorca, to the neglect of Rotlan's 'rural business' and to the loss of Dimitre's labour. The bailiff would not allow Rotlan to depart until the legal expenses, presumably those incurred by Sora and perhaps also those of Mianes, had been paid. Hence Rotlan's repeated efforts, in January and in April, to force Antoni Castanyer to assume his responsibility to make good the original sale of 1419. Exasperatingly, our document ends with the second summons to Castanyer to do this and we are not told the final result of Dimitre's appeal.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>32</sup> Sevillano, 'Demografia', 172-73 (these calculations do not appear in Verlinden, 'Une taxation').

<sup>33</sup> Gili, *Artà*, p. 219.

<sup>34</sup> Josep Ramis d'Ayreflor i Sureda, *Antigues possessions d'Artà. Notícies de les mateixes i dels seus senyors en els segles XIII, XIV i XV* (Palma, n. d.), pp. 52-53. This article originally appeared in *BSAL* 23-24 (1930-33); see 23 (1930-31) 519.

<sup>35</sup> See n. 12 on the text, below.

Other records of the time tell us more about both Rotlan and Castanyer. Rotlan appears, down at least to 1444, in sales of land in the parish of Artà. On one occasion his profession is given as that of a weaver (*peraire*). It may not be a coincidence that this was also the profession of Dimitre's father and that Rotlan intended to employ the boy in a trade he already knew.<sup>36</sup> Rotlan also appears in the list of slave owners of 1428, already referred to, as owning 'hun catiu'.<sup>37</sup> Since no names or racial origins are given for the 'captiffs' in Artà, one cannot say whether this 'captiff' was Dimitre or not.

Rotlan certainly owned other slaves. Although Dimitre's statement, in his petition, where he appears to suggest that he was only one of the 'many others' sold to Rotlan in 1419, is not born out by the sale contracts referred to, we have another document, dated 9 April 1426, the day before the second summons to Castanyer was issued. This document was drawn up by the scribe Pere Scarp, an assistant of Mianes who is also referred to in our document. It records another demand by the remarkably litigious Rotlan, this time concerning a Bulgar slave whose name is not given. Rotlan complains that he had been sold this slave by Jaume Mayrata, a notary of Sineu, for £ 108 10s. (a substantially larger sum than the £ 80 Rotlan had paid for Dimitre). In this case Mayrata and Pere Balaguer, also of Sineu, had promised to guarantee the sale. It had been discovered that the Bulgar was defective: 'Patitur morbum caducum' (presumably a reference to epilepsy). Rotlan alleges that Mayrata had previously sold the Bulgar to the knight Arnau de Torrella but had had to take him back. In his turn Rotlan demanded the return of the price he had paid. Mayrata, through his father acting as his procurator, replied that the slave was perfectly healthy. He was willing to submit the case to arbitration by medical experts and to accept their judgement. As in the previous case our document ends at this inconclusive stage.<sup>38</sup> It does suggest, however, that Rotlan was taking advantage of his enforced presence in the City of Majorca (where he was kept by the Dimitre case) to try to extract the sum he had paid for another slave, possibly before the Bulgar in question (who must also have been a Christian) imitated Dimitre and launched his own claim to liberty. This document also suggests that Rotlan did not declare all the slaves he owned in 1428.<sup>39</sup>

<sup>36</sup> For the documents on sales of land see Gili, *Artà*, pp. 142, 158, 176, 196. Since Gili's book has no index it is possible that I have missed another reference to Rotlan.

<sup>37</sup> Verlinden, 'Une taxation', 181; Sevillano, 'Demografia', 192. I have verified the entry in ARM *Lletres comunes* 103, fol. 222r.

<sup>38</sup> ARM *Protocolos*, M-155, fols. 54r-55v.

<sup>39</sup> The 1428 list includes a Pere Mayrata of Sineu, presumably a relative of the person sued by Rotlan two years earlier, who owned 'dos catius' (Verlinden, 'Une taxation', 173; Sevillano, 'Demografia', 183).

The merchant Antoni Castanyer appears in our document and also in the sale contracts of 1419 as having incurred the obligation technically known as 'evicció', that is, the duty to defend a sale against a claim by a third person based on a cause anterior to the sale.<sup>40</sup> Objections to a sale of a slave and attempts to rescind it would most often be based on a bodily defect that had not been declared by the seller, as Rotlan claimed was the case with the Bulgar he had bought from Mayrata, but they could also arise from the sale of someone who was in fact a free Christian. Castanyer is always addressed in our documents as 'honrat' or 'venerable', a rank not accorded in the hierarchy of Majorca to the weaver and landowner Rotlan or to the 'discreet' notaries referred to. Castanyer was in fact a well-known ship captain. He is recorded for instance as sailing in 1419 from Majorca to Flanders and in 1432 from Syracuse in Sicily to Majorca and thence to Barcelona and Flanders. He evidently owned a 'nau', one of the largest ships of the period, with two or three masts. He is one of the only two Majorcan owners of such a ship to appear in the selection of documents so far made available for this period.<sup>41</sup> He was clearly too important a person for it to be easy for Rotlan to pin him down.

The document published here may serve as an illustration of the way the extraordinarily rich archives of Majorca enable one to reconstruct the past relations of the island with far distant Mediterranean lands. One can see the way in which Catalan slave traders continued to prey on Greek Christians in the first quarter of the fifteenth century. Light is also cast on the internal history of Majorca itself, not only on the already well-known role of slaves in the island economy but on the forms of redress available at law, how it was possible for a Greek boy kidnapped at the age of fourteen and relegated as a slave to a remote corner of a far-off Mediterranean island to attempt to assert his right to freedom. By 1425 there were evidently far fewer Greek slaves in Majorca than there had been a hundred or fifty years earlier. Only two Greeks appear, designated as such, in the 1428 list, both in inland parishes; it is true that this list is far less detailed with regard to the later parishes it covers.<sup>42</sup> Johan Dimitre was not a unique case in Artà, however. There were at least three other Greeks enslaved there during the same years.<sup>43</sup> The island also contained numerous Bulgars, Russians, and other Eastern Christians.

<sup>40</sup> *Diccionari Català-Valencià-Balear*, 10 vols. (Barcelona, 1951-68), 5.635.

<sup>41</sup> Álvaro Santamaria, 'La reconquista de la vías marítimas', *Anuario de estudios medievales* 10 (1980) 41-133, at 85-86. For 'naos' see *Diccionari* 7.714 and F. Sevillano Colom, 'Navegaciones mediterraneas (siglos xi-xvi). Valor del Puerto de Mallorca' in *XI Congresso internazionale di storia marittima* (Bari, 1969), p. 36. There is a general discussion of the Majorcan merchant fleet in Macaire, *Majorque*, pp. 231-313.

<sup>42</sup> An unnamed 'catiu grech' appears at Marratxi and a 'Mitre' at Sencelles (Verlinden, 'Une taxation', 172-73; Sevillano, 'Demografia', 182-83). Both these parishes are some distance from Artà, and much closer to the City of Majorca.

<sup>43</sup> Two of them appear in the same sale of 1419 as our Dimitre. In 1424 one of seventeen sales of slaves refers to a Greek slave woman named Serena (Gili, *Artà*, pp. 215, 217).

Dimitre was probably not the only Eastern Christian slave attempting to claim his liberty in Majorca at this time. The fact that no objection was raised by Rotlan to the basis of Dimitre's claim — his Christianity — suggests that this had been successfully urged in earlier instances. We know that in 1367 an Armenian, sold and enslaved as a Tartar, had successfully appealed to the bishop of Majorca on the ground that he was a Catholic. The bishop, after examining him on the Catholic faith, had declared he should be treated as a free man.<sup>44</sup> Dimitre did not choose, however, to appeal to the Church but to the civil institution of 'advocat' and 'procurador' for the defense of 'poor and miserable persons'. This office appears to have been introduced into Majorca by Pere III of Catalonia (Pedro IV of Aragon) in 1343, immediately after his conquest of the island from his cousin and brother-in-law, Jaume III of Majorca. It was explicitly modelled on an institution existing in Valencia in 1337.<sup>45</sup> The advocates concerned were obliged to defend the poor and their fees were paid by the royal treasury. This arrangement was confirmed by Pere III in 1372.<sup>46</sup> Johan Sora, the notary who appears as 'procurador' in our document, was, therefore, authorized and obliged to act for Dimitre. The first impulse in the matter must, however, have come from Dimitre himself. It would be interesting to know not only if he proved successful in choosing this particular legal remedy but whether or not he found imitators among the many other Eastern Christian slaves on the island.<sup>47</sup>

\*  
\* \* \*

Throughout the text presented below I have introduced modern capitalisation and punctuation. Editorial insertions are indicated by square brackets. In transcribing the Catalan sections of the text I follow the new norms of the recently reconstituted Comissió Editora del Patronat Ramon Llull, charged with the critical edition of Lull's Catalan works. These norms differ in some respects from those followed by modern Catalan. In particular, the town where Dimitre was enslaved

<sup>44</sup> The document, of 6 September 1367, was published by Villanueva, *Viage* (cited above, n. 8), 22.253. I have verified it from the original in the Archivo Diocesano de Mallorca (Palma), Reg. Comm. 1.

<sup>45</sup> The parallel between our institution and that of the Consulate of the Sea is worth noting. Here again Pere III claimed to be introducing into Majorca an institution already in existence in Valencia. However, in the case of the Consulate it can be shown that it existed in Majorca in 1326. See Roman Piña Homs, *El Consolat del Mar; Mallorca 1326-1800* (Palma, 1985). That Pere was not above taking credit for ideas originating in Majorca is clear from his unacknowledged copying of Jaume III's *Leges palatinae* in his Catalan *Ordinacions*; see Olivetta Schena, *Le leggi palatini di Pietro IV d'Aragona* (Cagliari, 1983).

<sup>46</sup> Estanislau de K. Aguiló, 'Lletres Reials', *BSAL* 23 (1930-31) 31.

<sup>47</sup> As late as 1543 one finds a 'Mestre Joan Grech, former' (a baker), probably a liberated former slave, living in the City of Majorca and owning two Greek books (ARM Protocolos, S-1450, fols. 224r-226r).

is here transcribed as Artà, not Artà, as in modern usage (which I follow in the previous pages). I follow the Comissió's norms in distinguishing between *u* and *v* (vowel/consonant) and between *i* and *j*. Scribal corrections and minor difficulties are indicated in the notes on the text.

Suit brought by Miquel Rotlan against Anthoni Castanyer. (Archivo Histórico del Reino de Mallorca (Palma), Protocolos M-155, fols. 33r-35v)  
(f. 33r) Pro Michaele Rotlan<sup>1</sup> de Artano contra venerabilem Antonium Castanyer.

Noverint universi quod die martis, qua computabatur xv<sup>a</sup> mensis januarii anno a Nativitate Domini m<sup>o</sup>cccc<sup>o</sup>xx<sup>o</sup>vi<sup>o</sup>, ego Genisius Mianes, notarius Maioricarum, instantissime requisitus per subscriptum Michaellem Rotlandi, habitatorem parrochie de Artano, in presencia Petri Lensis fabri, et discreti Nicholai Brancha notarii, testium ad hoc vocatorum, legi et publicavi venerabili Anthonio Castanyerii infra nominato, personaliter invento in platea curiarum Maioricarum quandam papiri cedula, requisicionem et protestacionem in se continentem, per ipsum mihi traditam, cuius tenor talis est:

Con per lo discret En Johan Sora, notari, procurador de pobres e miserables persones e d'En Johan Dimitre, alias Andreu, sie stade presentade en la cort del honrat batle de Malorques contra En Miquell Rotlan, habitator de la parrochie de Artà,<sup>2</sup> senyor del dit catiu, la suplicació de la tenor seguent: Die jovis xx<sup>a</sup> mensis decembris anno a Nativitate Domini Millesimo cccc<sup>o</sup>xxv<sup>o</sup>, die et anno premissis, comparuit<sup>3</sup> in curia baiulie Maioricaum Johannes Dimitre, suplicans infrascriptus una alias<sup>4</sup> discreto Johanne Sora, notario Maioricarum, procuratore suo, et obtulit suplicacionem sequentem:

No sens rahó acorrent a la justicie e agualtat de vos honrat senyor En Guillem Huc, batle de la ciutat de Malorques, exposa humillment Yan alias<sup>5</sup> Johan Dimitre, ara emperó en Malorques nomenat Andreu, grech, naturalment crestià, franch e alforro, del loch o ciutat de Petras, alias Neopatrie, fil d'En Miquell Dimitre, texidó, e de la dona Margarita, muller sua, habitants de la dita ciutat de Petras, la qual es de la senyorie del senyor duch de Venecie, naturalment grechs crestians, e (f. 33v) de natura crestiana, molt indagudament e injusta furtat e pres forciivolment de la dita sua ter[ra] contra Deu e per dret de nació crestiana catalana e

<sup>1</sup> 'Michaele Rotlan' is substituted for 'Johanne Borrás'. Borrás, who was clearly an associate of Rotlan's, appears at the end of the document, as a witness to the presentation of a protest on Rotlan's behalf.

<sup>2</sup> The scribe originally wrote 'Artano'.

<sup>3</sup> The words 'in presenti' were originally written after 'comparuit' but later deleted.

<sup>4</sup> For the more usual 'cum'.

<sup>5</sup> The scribe began to write 'Dimitre' after 'alias'; 'Di' is deleted.

constituïda en pau e tranquillitat també ab lo dit senyor duch de Vanecie, senyor natural seu com ob lo dit Johan, e amenat assí en Malorques, vanut per sclau e ara axí indagudament detengut e greujat e inquietat per En Miquell Rotlan, de la parrochie d'Artá, o En Johan Sora, notari de Malorques, procurador de misserables persones, dient que stant en la dita se [sa] terra o termens de aquella, ansemp[s] ab altres, faents lurs negocis, los homens de una nau de catalans, la quall se deia era d'En Barthomeu Lorens, la quall era en la marina de la dita ciutat, isqueran en terra e ab maneres malvades e iniques indogudament, ensemps ab hun appellat N'Oliver e altres prengueran lo dit Johan, ensemps ab altres, los quals forssadament e malvada materan<sup>6</sup> dins en la dita nau, ab la qual los apportaren en la illa de Sicilia, en la qual volien vendra aquells. E les gens sertificats de la dita malesa no u volguerán comprar nágún. E après, duptant se de la malesa, reculliren aquest e los altres ab una altre nau d'En Martí Xanxo de Valencia e amanaren los assí en la illa de Malorques, en la qual en lo loch de Artá vaneran aquest e molts d'altres molt malvadament, contra Deu e tot dret, al dit Miquel Rotlan.

On honrat senyor, con segons disposició de dret divinal e humanal lo dit Johan, crestiá, naturalment grech, fill de pare e mare naturalment grechs, e franch, pres en la manera dessús dita per amichs seus e del dit senyor duch, no puscha ne dege esser catiu ne esser posat en alguna captivitat, ans les dites tals vendes e actes per aquells perpetrats e fets sien nulles, no perjudicar a la libertat del dit Johan alias Andreu, per tant lo dit Johan alias Andreu e lo dit Johan Sora, notari, en nom que demunt, supplica e raquer-vos dit honrat batla de que.n sobra les dites coses esser rebuda informació, sumariament e de pla, con axí ho requira la qualitat del nagoci. E après per vostra diffinitiva sentència esser pronunciat e declarat lo dit Johan alias Andreu, grech, nat de pare e mara grechs e franchs, esser franch e alforra e quiti de tot jou e captivitat e servitut del dit Miquel Rotlan e de tota altre persona, condemnant aquell Miquel en desrenclir (f. 34r) e desliurar aquell Johan alias Andreu, con a franch, alforra e quiti de tot jou de captivitat e servitut, e en tota la servitut obtenguda de aquell fins e quant será quiti de sa potestat e en tots los dans, messions e despesas, fetes e fasadores, de les quals expressament protesta contra aquell Miquel e sos bens, lo vostra honorable offici en quant sia necessari sobre les dites coses humilment implorant. Protesta emperó que per los presents actes no sia fet ne engenrat algun perjudici a alsguns procehiments precedentment fets ne en nagunes accions, les quals a aquell Andreu pertanguen en qualsevol manera ves e contra lo dit Miquel e bens seus, ans aquells romanguen salves e illeses.

E de vos honrat senyor N'Anthoni Castanyer, mercader de Malorques, qui en la venda del dit Andreu catiu feta per En Daniel de Sant Martí, mercader de la dita ciutat de Valencia, procurador d'En Martí Sa Coma, mercader de la dita ciutat de

<sup>6</sup> For 'meteren' ('put into'), not 'mataren' ('killed').

Valencia, al dit Miquel Rotlan, per preu de vuytanta llibres, sots entrat fermansa e principal responador, segons pus larch appar de la dita venda per carta feta en poder del discret En Genís Mianes, notari de Mallorques, sa pertangue per rahó de la evicció promesa per vos la dita questió en vos pendra e mantenir, deffendra e a deguda fi menar a vostres messions e despesas e deffencions a aquell donar e administrar, ensemps ab les messions e despesas necessaries e oportunes e la dita questió e deffenció de aquella, axí en advocat, procurador, e scriptures con en altra manera, per tant lo dit Miquel Rotlan per conservació de son dret e son propi interès, jatsia per virtut de les primitives requestes a vos fetes, vos dit Anthoni Castanyer, fermansa e responador principal, algunes deffencions, instruccions o informacions no us siats curades donar-ne al dit Johan Borrás administrar, en gran colpa e carrech vostre, vos requir a major cautela que a la dita questió vos oposets e de aquella vos emparets e a vostres messions e despesas,<sup>7</sup> deffenats e a deguda fi manets, axí con fer devets e sots tengut per la dita evicció promesa, o legitimas deffencions donets per la (f. 34v) qual se puxa deffendra de la dita questió, e messions e despesas li administrets, axí de scriptures, advocat, procurador e altres coses a la dita questió necessaries e a la dita deffenció de aquella. En altra manera, si les dites coses fer no volrets o recusarets, protesta contra vos de tots dans, messions, interesses e despesas, fetes e fasadores per la dita rahó, e de la mes valensa del dit catiu, e de tots jornals de les persones dels dits catiu e Miquel Rotlan, axí en venir, star assí, e tornar a la dita parroquia d'Artá e cavalcadures e de perill de mort e fuyta del dit catiu e de totes altres coses qui necessaries e legudes li sian protestar, requirent les dites coses a vos esser lestes e intimades o carta una o moltes publiques esser fetes per lo notari devall scrit per haver memoria en esdavenidor de les dites coses.

Quibusquidem lectis, publicatis et intimatis dicto venerabili Anthonio Castanyerii in presencia et testimonio prenominatorum testium, idem venerabilis Anthonius Castanyerii peciit copiam et transumptum de premissis sibi dari, protestans quod tempus aliquod sibi non labatur donech dictam copiam habuerit.

Copia vero premissorum fuit perfecta et tradita per me dictum notarium dicto venerabili Anthonio Castanyerii dicta eadem die martis quinta decima mensis januarii anno predicto Millesimo cccc<sup>o</sup> vicesimo sexto, in presencia discreti Johannis Pont notarii, Bernardi Borrás, et Anthonii Savi, mercatorum, testium ad hec vocatorum et interpellatorum, scilicet hora vesperorum diei eiusdem vel inde circa.

Post predicta die jovis x<sup>a</sup> mensis aprilis anno a Nativitate Domini m<sup>o</sup>cccc<sup>o</sup>xxvi<sup>o</sup> predicto comparuit coram me dicto notario dictus Michael Rot(f. 35r)landi et presentavit sequenciam, requirens ea legi, intimari et publicari<sup>8</sup> dicto venerabili

<sup>7</sup> A clause, 'li administrets axí de scriptures' (see below), was first inserted here and then deleted.

<sup>8</sup> 'Publicati' *ante correctionem*.

Anthonio Castanyerii et continuari in pede premissorum sub uno et eodem instrumento, in presencia Johannis Pont notarii et Petrus Scarp, scriptoris, testium ad hec vocatorum.

Con vos honrat senyor N'Anthoni Castanyer, per virtut de la precedent requesta vos siats emperat de la questió moguda contra lo dit Miquell Rotlan per rahó del catiu, promatent aquella menar a vestras despeses e fins, así no us siats curat de fer algun procehiment o anantament en la dita questió ne vullats bestraura les messions de les scriptures fetes per part del dit catiu, ans ha covengut al dit Miquell manar lo dit catiu así per informar lo dit procurador seu per manament del honrat batle, lo quall ha .vi. dies que es en ciutat, perdent los fets he negocis del dit Miquell rusticals e jornals del dit catiu, con lo dit honrat batle no vulla ne prometa leixar anar lo dit catiu fins a tant sien pagades les dites scriptures. E vos siats stat request de paraula per lo dit Miquell que les dites scriptures deguessets pagar e la dita questió sollicitar, la<sup>9</sup> qual cosa fer no avets volgude estró así, en gran dan e perjudici del dit Miquell. Per tant lo dit Miquell Rotlan en aquests scrits vos requir que la dita questió ab gran sollicitació e cura dejats menar e fer desempetxar, e messions e scriptures dejats pagar al dit scrivá de la causa, axí con fer devets e sots tengut. En altra manera protesta de negligencia e mala cura e triga<sup>10</sup> e de tots dans, messions e despeses e interesses e de fuyta e perill de mort del dit catiu, e de totes altres coses de las quals legudes e nessesaries li sien protestar, estant e perseverant en les dites requesta e protestació demunt fetes e intimades al dit Anthoni Castanyer, e de aquellas no departint-se en res. Requirant les dites coses al dit Anthoni esser lestes e intimades e continuades en lo peu de las dites requestes e protestació, sots una matexa carta per lo dit notari.

(f. 35v) Quibus si quidem proxime presentatis per dictum Michaellem Rotlandi, quasi in continenti ego dictus Genisius Mianes, notarius, cum ingenti instancia requisitus, legi, publicavi et intimavi dicto venerabili Anthonio Castanyerii in platea curiarum personaliter reperto predicta per dictum Michaellem proxime presentata, in presencia discreti Francissi Carabotini, notarii, et Johannis Borrás de Artan[o], testium ad hec vocatorum et interpellatorum. Qui quidem venerabilis Anthonius Castanyerii, audito tenore premissorum sibi lectorum, peciit copiam sibi dari; de lapsu temporis expresse protestatus fuit. Que quidem copia fuit per me dictum notarium dicto venerabili Anthonio concessio<sup>11</sup> eidemque tradita die veneris xi<sup>a</sup> mensis aprilis anno predicto hora vesperorum diey eiusdem in presencia ....<sup>12</sup>

<sup>9</sup> 'La' appears to be written twice *ante correctionem*.

<sup>10</sup> The scribe appears to have written 'en tri', then deleted 'tri' and added 'triga'. I think 'e triga' ('and delay') follows more logically from the previous clauses.

<sup>11</sup> 'Cons(esso)' *ante correctionem*.

<sup>12</sup> The document ends here, without specifying the names of the witnesses or any further proceedings, nor are these indicated in the rest of this protocol. I am grateful to my friend Anthony Bonner for assisting me with some difficulties in the Catalan text.



THE *ALIA LITTERA*  
IN  
THOMAS AQUINAS' *SENTENTIA LIBRI METAPHYSICAE*

*James P. Reilly, Jr.*

THE medieval commentator on Aristotle, like his counterpart, the commentator on Scripture, was often confronted with several Latin translations of the same work from different sources. A necessary task for each commentator was to determine, if possible, which translation expressed more clearly the genuine text of either Aristotle or Scripture. Given, however, the state of medieval Latin translations, this was often a difficult task.<sup>1</sup> Consequently, even after selecting a particular translation as the basis for his commentary, the commentator on either Aristotle or Scripture sometimes cited the readings of another translation, the *alia littera*, for the purpose of clarifying the text or because he judged the alternate version to be either better or clearer.<sup>2</sup>

As a commentator on both philosophical and sacred works, Thomas Aquinas faced the same task. For example, in the prologue to his commentary on the *Psalms*, Thomas observes that there were three extant Latin translations: (1) a correction by Jerome of an early Latin translation, used in Italy; (2) a translation by Jerome from the Greek, used in France; and (3) a translation by Jerome from the Hebrew, not used in any church, but nevertheless in circulation.<sup>3</sup> According

<sup>1</sup> For a detailed study of one such translation, see G. Vuillemin-Diem, 'Recensio Palatina und Recensio Vulgata. Wilhelm von Moerbekes doppelte Redaktion der Metaphysikübersetzung', *Miscellanea mediaevalia* 18 (1986) 289-366 and 'La traduction de la Métaphysique d'Aristote par Guillaume de Moerbeke et son exemplaire grec: Vind. Phil. Gr. 100 (J)' in *Aristoteles. Werk und Wirkung Paul Moraux gewidmet*, ed. J. Wiesner (Berlin, 1987), pp. 434-86. For a similar study, see R. A. Gauthier, ed., *Sentencia libri De anima* (Leonine edition 45/1.129\*-99\*).

<sup>2</sup> For a discussion of these uses of the *alia littera*, see below, pp. 569-76.

<sup>3</sup> See St. Thomas, *In psalmos Davidis expositio*, ed. S. E. Freté (Vivès edition 18.230): 'Translationes sunt tres. Una a principio ecclesiae terrenae tempore Apostolorum, et haec vitata erat tempore Hieronymi propter scriptores. Unde ad preces Damasi Papae Hieronymus Psalterium correxit, et hoc legitur in Italia. Sed quia haec translatio discordabat a graeco, transtulit rursus Hieronymus ad preces Paulae de graeco in latinum, et hoc Damasus Papa fecit cantari in Francia, et concordat de verbo ad verbum cum graeco. Post quidam Sophronius aliquando disputans cum Iudaeis, cum dicerent Iudaei aliqua non sic se habere, sicut ex secunda translatione psalterii introduxerat, dictus Sophronius rogavit Hieronymum, ut Psalterium de hebraeo in latinum transferret. Cujus petitioni annuit Hieronymus; quae translatio concordat omnino cum hebraeo, sed non cantatur in aliqua ecclesia; habetur tamen a multis'. See also J. A. Weisheipl, *Friar Thomas d'Aquino: His Life, Thought, and Work*, 2nd edition (Washington, D. C., 1983), pp. 303-304.

to J. A. Weisheipl, Thomas used the second translation, known as the Gallican Psalter, as the basis for his commentary, and cited the first translation, the so-called Roman Psalter, as the *alia littera*.<sup>4</sup>

Similarly, in his commentaries on Aristotle, Thomas was aware of the existence of several Latin translations from both Greek and Arabic sources. His concern for the accuracy of the available translations has, in part, led some historians to claim that William of Moerbeke translated or revised earlier translations of the works of Aristotle at the behest of Aquinas.<sup>5</sup> Such a claim has its source in this entry in the Catalogue of Stams: 'Fr. Wilhelmus Brabantinus, Corinthiensis, transtulit omnes libros naturalis et moralis philosophiae de graeco in latinum ad instantiam fratris Thomae'.<sup>6</sup> The assertion is seemingly affirmed by the testimony of William of Tocco, who intimates that the *nova translatio*, namely, that of William of Moerbeke, was made at the instigation of Thomas: 'Scripsit [Thoma] super Philosophiam naturalem et moralem, et metaphysicam quorum librorum procuravit, quod fieret nova translatio, quae sententiae Aristotelis continet clarius veritatem ....'<sup>7</sup>

This claim of the historians, who have alleged a close cooperation between Moerbeke and Aquinas in the matter of translations, has been refuted decisively.<sup>8</sup> Nevertheless, from an examination of his Aristotelian commentaries, it seems evident that Thomas was concerned with the accuracy of the different Latin translations of Aristotle and that, when available, he preferred the translations of Moerbeke for his commentaries,<sup>9</sup> even though in his major works he sometimes cited earlier translations from the Greek or Arabic instead of the Moerbeke translation which he already knew.<sup>10</sup>

The purpose, therefore, of this article is twofold: (1) to establish, from a study of the *alia littera* in the *Sententia libri Metaphysicae* and, indirectly, of the implicit citations of other translations in the same commentary, that Thomas was certainly concerned with the accuracy of the several Latin translations to which he had access and that, for the most part, he did indeed prefer Moerbeke's translation of

<sup>4</sup> See Weisheipl, *ibid.*, p. 304.

<sup>5</sup> For example, see V. J. Bourke, *Aquinas' Search for Wisdom* (Milwaukee, 1965), pp. 110 ff., and M. Grabmann, *Guglielmo di Moerbeke, O.P., il traduttore delle opere di Aristotele* (Rome, 1946), pp. 62-84. For a more complete list, see Weisheipl, *ibid.* pp. 149-50, and the relevant bibliography, pp. 408-10.

<sup>6</sup> See G. Meersseman, *Laurentii Pignon Catalogi et cronica. Accedunt catalogi Stamsensis et Upsalensis scriptorum O.P.* (Rome, 1936), p. 62 n. 33.

<sup>7</sup> See A. Ferrua, *S. Thomae Aquinatis vitae fontes praecipuae* (Alba, 1968), p. 57.

<sup>8</sup> See R. A. Gauthier, ed., *Sententia libri Ethicorum* (Leonine edition 47/1.232\*-34\*); see also Gauthier, *Sententia libri De anima*, pp. 176\*-99\*. Note especially the first paragraph on p. 176\*. See also Weisheipl, *Friar Thomas d'Aquino*, pp. 150-53.

<sup>9</sup> For example, see Weisheipl, *ibid.*, pp. 149-53; see also Gauthier, *Sententia libri De anima*, p. 129\*.

<sup>10</sup> See Gauthier, *Sententia libri Ethicorum*, p. 232\*; see also Weisheipl, *ibid.*, p. 152.

Aristotle's *Metaphysics* to the other Latin translations; and (2) to assess Thomas' use of the *alia littera* in this commentary.

Previous research on the *alia littera* by B. Geyer and F. Pelster had as its primary intention the identification of the Latin translations employed by Thomas in his commentary on the *Metaphysics*.<sup>11</sup> This particular study, though indebted to their research, has, as just indicated, a different purpose. However, as a preliminary step, it is necessary now to give an account of the current state of research on the *alia littera*, which is, in effect, a continuation of the earlier research of Geyer and Pelster.

### THE ALIA LITTERA

In seventy-eight places in the *Sententia libri Metaphysicae*, Thomas Aquinas cites explicitly a second and, on occasion, a third Latin translation of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, while commenting upon a word, phrase or clause of Aristotle's text. He cites these translations under the rubric *alia littera* or *alia translatio*;<sup>12</sup> in seven places he refers to them as the *littera Boethii*.<sup>13</sup> There are, then, eighty-six explicit citations in the seventy-eight places. Besides these explicit citations, there are also numerous implicit citations of the several Latin translations, which citations are usually introduced by such words as *siue*, *uel*, *id est* or *scilicet*.

As the basis of his commentary on the *Metaphysics*, Thomas used three different Latin translations of the Greek text.<sup>14</sup> These translations are distributed according to books, or parts of books, as follows:<sup>15</sup>

<sup>11</sup> See B. Geyer, 'Die Übersetzungen der aristotelischen Metaphysik bei Albertus Magnus und Thomas von Aquin', *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* 30 (1917) 392-415 and F. Pelster, 'Die Übersetzungen der aristotelischen Metaphysik in den Werken des hl. Thomas von Aquin', *Gregorianum* 16 (1935) 531-48.

<sup>12</sup> The expression *alia littera* is used in the title and throughout the article in conformity with its earlier usage by Geyer and Pelster (see above, n. 11). This expression is sometimes used interchangeably by Thomas with the expression *alia translatio*. However, it should be noted that in Thomas' vocabulary both terms may refer, not simply to another translation, but also to alternative renditions of a word or phrase in the same translation. For a discussion of the latter possibility, see Vuillemin-Diem, 'Recensio Palatina und Recensio Vulgata', 363-66, as well as 'La traduction', 438. For an example, see below, Table 1, 1413.

<sup>13</sup> For a discussion of the *littera Boethii*, see G. Vuillemin-Diem, ed., *Metaphysica* (Lib. I-IV, 4). *Translatio Iacobi sive 'Vetustissima' cum scholiis et Translatio Composita sive 'Vetus'* (Aristoteles Latinus 25.1-1; Leiden, 1970), pp. XII-XVI, and G. Diem, 'Les traductions gréco-latines de la Métaphysique au moyen âge: le problème de la *Metaphysica Vetus* \*', *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* 49 (1967) 9-10 and 16. See also Pelster, 'Die Übersetzungen der aristotelischen Metaphysik in den Werken des hl. Thomas von Aquin', 338-44.

<sup>14</sup> A detailed study of this topic will appear in the Preface to the forthcoming Leonine edition of the *Sententia libri Metaphysicae*. For some bibliography on the use of the translation of William of Moerbeke, see Diem, 'Les traductions', 21 n. 68.

<sup>15</sup> The books and chapters coincide with those in the forthcoming critical edition. However,

<i>Book</i>	<i>Translation</i>
I	<i>Anonyma</i> <sup>16</sup>
II-III	<i>Moerbecana</i> <sup>17</sup>
IV.1-6	<i>Iacobi</i> <sup>18</sup>
IV.7-v.16	<i>Anonyma</i>
v.17-36	<i>Moerbecana</i>
VI-VII	<i>Moerbecana</i>
VIII.1-6	<i>Anonyma</i>
VIII.7	<i>Moerbecana</i>
IX-XII	<i>Moerbecana</i>

The same translations were the principal sources of the *alia littera* as well as the implicit citations. There were, however, other sources of both the explicit and implicit citations, e.g., the *Translatio composita*,<sup>19</sup> the *Translatio Scoti*,<sup>20</sup> and perhaps some marginal glosses from a more complete version of the *Translatio Iacobi*.<sup>21</sup>

because the critical text is not yet published, the relevant line number in each chapter cannot be given. Thus, in each entry below, the appropriate paragraph number in the 1964 Marietti edition of this commentary is supplied.

<sup>16</sup> See G. Vuillemin-Diem, ed., *Metaphysica (Lib. I-X, XII-XIV). Translatio Anonyma sive 'Media'* (Aristoteles Latinus 25.2; Leiden, 1976). Throughout the article and in the three tables and the appendix, this translation is identified by the letter *A*.

<sup>17</sup> The editor of the forthcoming edition of Moerbeke's translation for the Aristoteles Latinus series, G. Vuillemin-Diem, has sent to me, prior to publication, a copy of the critical text and the relevant *apparatus criticus*. She has graciously consented to my use of this text. The corresponding Bekker number or numbers serve as the reference for any citation of this critical text or of the *apparatus criticus*. Throughout the article and in the three tables and the appendix, this translation is identified by the letter *M*. In the critical text of the Aristoteles Latinus, Moerbeke's translation is identified by the letter *G* (*Translatio Guillelmi*).

<sup>18</sup> See above, n. 13. Throughout the article and in the three tables, this translation is identified by the letter *J*.

<sup>19</sup> See above, n. 13. Throughout the article and in the three tables, this translation is identified by the letter *C*.

<sup>20</sup> See *Aristotelis Metaphysicorum libri XIII cum Averrois Cordubensis in eosdem commentariis ...* (Venice, 1574). There are two Latin translations of Aristotle's *Metaphysics* in this volume. The first is the translation of Cardinal Bessarion (c. 1400-72); see F. E. Cranz, 'The Publishing History of the Aristotelian Commentaries of Thomas Aquinas', *Traditio* 34 (1978) 177. According to information supplied by G. Vuillemin-Diem, Bessarion used the Moerbeke translation as the basis for his own translation. Hereafter, throughout the article and in the three tables, this translation is identified by the letter *B*. The second translation, presumably by Michael Scot, is from the Arabic; hereafter, throughout the article and in the three tables, identified by the letter *S*. This translation is followed by the commentary of Averroes. All folio references to this volume are given within square brackets.

<sup>21</sup> For example: the editor of the *Translatio anonyma*, speaking of some probable citations to a now lost part of the *Translatio Iacobi*, says: 'Mais probablement, St. Thomas n'avait pas accès au texte complet: il a trouvé, sans doute, ces citations comme notes marginales dans son exemplaire de la *Metaphysica media*' (Diem, 'Les traductions', 10).

In this commentary, then, there are both implicit and explicit (i.e., *alia littera*) citations from five different Latin translations, four from Greek and one from Arabic. The former occur almost everywhere in the text; the latter do not. Thus, there are no *alia littera* in books II, X, XI or XII, but two in book VI and only one each in books VIII and IX. The remaining *alia littera* are distributed as follows: book I, twelve; book III, six; book IV, thirty-three; book V, twenty-four; and book VII, seven.<sup>22</sup>

Of the eighty-six *alia littera*, sixty-five have been positively identified. The majority have their source in the *Translatio Moerbecana*. Except for two, whose source is the *Translatio Scoti*, the remainder have been taken from the *Translatio anonyma*, *Iacobi* or *composita*.

The other twenty-one *alia littera* have not been found in any of the translations mentioned in the preceding paragraph. It should be noted, however, that these instances occur in the parts of the text for which there is no extant translation of *J* or *C*.<sup>23</sup> Current research shows that of the twenty-one *alia littera* in question here, thirteen are of unknown or doubtful origin; one has been found in *B*; seven have been found either in the margins or between the lines of one or more of the manuscripts which carry the *Translatio Moerbecana*.<sup>24</sup> The last mentioned are:<sup>25</sup>

663      iv.10

Dicit ... quod non est idem modus homelie ... (scilicet uel bonae constructionis, secundum aliam translationem ... uel intercessionis, sicut in graeco habetur ...)...  
A (1009a17)<sup>26</sup>

v. Fā: *in marg.* al' (?) bone (?) constructionis in (?) greco intercessionis.<sup>27</sup>

<sup>22</sup> For a list of all the *alia littera*, see below, Table 1.

<sup>23</sup> Both translations, *J* and *C*, terminate at iv.4 (1007a32).

<sup>24</sup> These are: (Bx) Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale II.2314 (2893), fols. 2r-123v = A.L. #174; (Cq) Cambridge, Peterhouse 22, fols. 1r-376v = A.L. #247; (Db<sup>1</sup>) Dubrovnik, Dominikanska Biblioteka 6 (sub vitro), fols. 1r-92v = A.L. #2167; (K) Kalocsa, Biblioteca Ecclesiae Metropolitanae 97, fols. 1r-54v = A.L. #2140; (Pd<sup>2</sup>) Padua, Biblioteca Capitolare D. 41, fols. 1r-111v = A.L. #1840; (W<sup>3</sup>) Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek 1434, fols. 1r-203v = A.L. #101. See G. Lacombe, ed., *Aristoteles Latinus. Codices*, 2 vols. (Rome-Cambridge, 1939-55); L. Minio-Paluello, ed., *Aristoteles Latinus. Codices. Supplementa altera* (Bruges, 1961).

<sup>25</sup> In these and subsequent entries, prior to the presentation of the *alia littera*, the context in which the *alia littera* occur is given, followed by the sigla of the translation Thomas is commenting upon and by the corresponding Bekker number(s). The precise word or words of this translation are given in the footnotes. In the case where the reading or readings of two or more translations coincide, the sigla of the translation Thomas is commenting upon is given first.

<sup>26</sup> See A: 'idem modus omelie'. Except for the omission of 'omelie', *M* reads with A.

<sup>27</sup> In the corresponding *apparatus criticus* of *M*, n. 302, the editor notes: '... al' (?) bone (?) constructionis in (?) greco intercessionis mg. Fā<sup>26</sup> ....' The editor then asks: 'an bone constructionis (εὐτερέξεως?) glossa ex alia translatione (Iacobi?) in margine exemplaris Translationis Anonymae erat? An Guillelmus Translationis Anonymae verbum omelie in textu non correxit sed tantum delevit, et translationem suam, aliquo tempore post, in margine solum adnotavit?'

- 944 v.16  
... ut parastata tritostata est prius ... unde alia translatio habet: 'praestans tertio stante prius est'. *A M* (1018b27-28)<sup>28</sup>  
v. W<sup>3</sup> (f. 81va): *in marg.* a<sup>a</sup> tn.<sup>a</sup> prestans tertio stante prius est.
- 957-958 v.17  
Aliquando uero non dicitur aliquis potens ex hoc quod potest pati aliquod malum sed ex hoc quod potest pati aliquid excellentius .... Alia tamen translatio habet 'aliquando autem non secundum omnem passionem sed utique in contrarium'. *A* (1019a22-23)<sup>29</sup>  
v. Bx (f. 42v): *in marg.* a<sup>a</sup> translatio sed utique in contrarium et est sensus contrarius primo.  
v. Ne<sup>2</sup>: *in marg.* .a. sed utique ad contrarium.<sup>30</sup>  
v. Pd<sup>2</sup> (f. 36r): autopathein: *supra lin.* .i. pati in contrarium.
- 991-992 v.19  
... quod existit in substantia numeri praeter ipsam quantitatem .... Alia littera habet 'secundum quantitatem' .... Et huic concordat littera sequens .... *MA* (1020b6)<sup>31</sup>  
v. Bx (f. 44r): *in marg.* a<sup>a</sup> 1r<sup>a</sup> secundum quantitatem et magis concordat textui.  
v. sCq (f. 145va) et Pd<sup>2</sup> (f. 37r): preter: *supra lin.* uel secundum.
- 1068 v.26  
... quae habent magnitudinem nocuenti, sicut magnae calamitates et magnae tristitiae ... alia littera habet quod magnitudines lamentationum et exultationum passiones dicuntur ... cui concordat alia translatio, quae dicit 'magnitudines dolorum et prosperorum'. *M* (1022b20-21)<sup>32</sup>  
'magnitudines exultationum et lamentationum passiones dicuntur'. *A*  
v. Bx (f. 46v): *in marg.* alia littera magnitudines lamentationum et exultationum passiones dicuntur alia translatio magnitudines dolorum et prosperorum.  
v. V (f. 162va): *in marg.* al' magnitudines lamentationum et exultationum al' magnitudines dolorum et prosperorum.  
v. sCq (f. 153rb): *supra lin.* a. 1. lamentationum et exultationum. *et in marg.* a. t. magnitudines dolorum et prosperorum (?).
- 1109 v.32  
... quod est oppositum toti quod est colobon, pro quo alia translatio habet

<sup>28</sup> See *A M*: 'ut parastata tritostata prius'.

<sup>29</sup> See *A*: 'quandoque vero non secundum omnem passionem sed si in excellentiorem'; see also *M*: 'quandoque autem non secundum omnem passionem sed si ad melius'; and also *B* [121re].

<sup>30</sup> In the corresponding *apparatus criticus* of *M*, n. 359, the editor asks: 'an e translatione Iacobi perdita?'

<sup>31</sup> See *MA*: 'preter quantitatem'.

<sup>32</sup> See *M*: 'magnitudines calamitatum et tristium'.

'diminutum membro' .... Videtur autem esse colobon quod nos dicimus 'truncatum'; unde et Boethius transtulit 'mancum'. *MA* (1024a11)<sup>33</sup>

'diminutum membrum' *S* [139rB]

v. Dk<sup>1</sup> (f. 51): *supra lin.* uel mancum; *in marg.* .i. truncatum, 1ra. goris habet diminutum membro.

1344

vii.4

Sicut si accipiamus haec tria, nasus et concauitas et simitas: concauitas est simplex accidens, praecipue per comparisonem ad nasum, non enim est nasus de intellectu concaui .... Et nec concauitas neque simitas est passio nasi secundum accidens ... sed simitas est passio nasi secundum se .... Alia autem translatio loco eius quod est concauum habet 'aquilum' et est planior sensus quia in definitione aquili ponitur nasus sicut in definitione simi. *MA* (1030b16-20)<sup>34</sup>

v. Bx (f. 55v): *in marg.* alia translatio loco concaui habet aquilum et tunc est sensus planius > planior quia in diffinitione aquili ponitur nasus sicut in diffinitione simi.

v. Dk<sup>1</sup> (f. 58v): *in marg.* alia littera nec aquilum.

The sources of these particular *alia littera* are uncertain.<sup>35</sup> Some, in fact, may have been taken, either directly or indirectly, from Thomas' commentary itself. This is more likely in the case of the *alia littera* found in the manuscripts with Moerbeke's translations, which manuscripts are posterior to 1275, the date of the first Parisian exemplar.<sup>36</sup> For example: W<sup>3</sup> has both the translation of Moerbeke and the commentary of Thomas. The text of the Moerbeke translation is derived from the first Parisian exemplar but with added mistakes and corrections. Moreover, the hand which recorded the *alia translatio* in the margin of W<sup>3</sup> (fol. 81va) seems different from the hand which copied the text. Also, the text of the *alia translatio* is underlined in the commentary (see W<sup>3</sup>, fol. 82ra). It seems probable, then, that this *alia translatio* could have been taken from the commentary itself.<sup>37</sup>

On the other hand, a few of these *alia littera* may have been taken from some state of the Moerbeke translation which had alternative readings either in the margins or between the lines. For example, in the first instance cited above, there are, in effect, two *alia littera*: 'bonae constructionis' and 'intercessionis'. Both are

<sup>33</sup> See *MA*: 'colobon'.

<sup>34</sup> See *MA*: 'Dico autem ut est nasus et concavitas et simitas ... et non secundum accidens ... nam nec concavitas nec simitas passio nasi, sed secundum se'.

<sup>35</sup> I am indebted to G. Vuillemin-Diem for the information and insights which have contributed materially to the discussion in this paragraph and the one following.

<sup>36</sup> See Vuillemin-Diem, 'La traduction', 435.

<sup>37</sup> For other probable examples, see above, p. 564: 1068, v.26, where the notes in Cq are not first hand and where the two *alia littera* cited, namely, the *Translatio anonyma* and the unidentified *alia littera*, are expressed in exactly the same terms as in the commentary itself. See above also (on this page): 1344, vii.4.

found in the margin of ms. Fä.<sup>38</sup> The source of this and similar additions (corrections?) are in part the *Translatio anonyma*, in part the independent Moerbeke tradition, and in part something from the Greek.<sup>39</sup> Such additions of this kind are found everywhere in Fä, even in the last two books of the *Metaphysics*, where no influence of the *alia littera* in Thomas' commentary was possible. Thus it seems probable that here and elsewhere the source of the *alia littera* was some state of the Moerbeke translation with alternative readings, either marginal or interlinear.<sup>40</sup>

It is likely that Thomas also found the *alia littera*, which he cited, as marginal or interlinear glosses in the manuscript(s) of the several translations which he used in his commentary. For example, in book I Thomas used the *Translatio anonyma* as the basis for his commentary.<sup>41</sup> There are, however, both implicit and explicit citations to some state of the *Translatio Moerbecana* as well as to the other two translations, *Iacobi* and *composita*. Thus, of the twelve *alia littera* in book I, four have their source in *M*, three in *J*, one in *JM*, and three in *C*.<sup>42</sup> And so, it seems probable that the origins of these *alia littera* as well as the implicit citations in book I were marginal or interlinear glosses. Therefore, even if it is impossible to identify precisely the manuscripts of the different translations that Thomas used as the basis for his commentary, it is nonetheless reasonable to suppose that these manuscripts were glossed in a similar way.

The following is the only *alia littera* found in *B* and nowhere else:

642 IV.8

... in quibus non est uerum erunt confessae ... uel certae ... secundum aliam translationem. *A M* (1008a11-12)<sup>43</sup>

'certae essent' *B* [82vL]

However, in addition to this *alia littera* found only in *B*, seventeen *alia littera*, whose source is *M*, are also found in *B*.<sup>44</sup> Moreover, in some places in the text,

<sup>38</sup> That is, ms. Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana Faesul. 167: saec. XIII/XIV.

<sup>39</sup> The pattern of correction and modification of Moerbeke's translation reflected in ms. Fä is similar in some respects to the origins of the Moerbeke translation itself, which is partly a revision according to the Greek of an earlier translation, namely, the *anonyma*, and partly a new translation; see Vuillemin-Diem, 'La traduction', 436.

<sup>40</sup> See Diem, 'Les traductions', 10; see also L. Minio-Paluello, 'Note sull'Aristotele latino medievale I (La "Metaphysica Vetustissima" comprendeva tutta la Metafisica?)', *Rivista di filosofia neo-scolastica* 42 (1950) 222-26.

<sup>41</sup> See Vuillemin-Diem, 'La traduction', 479 n. 34 and Diem, 'Les traductions', 54-55.

<sup>42</sup> See below, Table 1.

<sup>43</sup> See *A M*: 'erunt confesse'.

<sup>44</sup> They are as follows: *M* (1008a28) and *B* [83rA]; *M* (1008a34) and *B* [83rA]; *M* (1009b18-19) and *B* [88rc]; *M* (1009b24-25) and *B* [88rd]; *M* (1009b30) and *B* [88rd]; *M* (1010a18-19) and *B* [89vm]; *M* (1010b4) and *B* [91rf]; *M* (1014b10) and *B* [105rA]; *M* (1014b16) and *B* [106vh]; *M* (1014b20) and *B* [106vi]; *M* (1014b21) and *B* [106vi]; *M* (1014b22) and *B* [106vi]; *M*



a number of the implicit citations are identical with the readings in *B*. For example: of some forty implicit citations in books v.17 *ad fin.* vii, there are fourteen which are found only in *B*. In nine other implicit citations, the reading is the same in *M* and *B*, or in *S* and *B*. From this evidence, it seems clear that the text of *B* is derived, in great measure, from the translation of Moerbeke.<sup>45</sup> Perhaps, if the origins of *B* could be determined more precisely, it might be possible to discover further implicit citations, and even some of the unidentified *alia littera*.

Of the thirteen *alia littera* whose origins are unknown or doubtful, the four doubtful are given below as well as one example of the *alia littera* whose origins are unknown. The four *alia littera* of doubtful origin are:

653 iv.9

... in nullo uidetur differre a plantis .... Alia translatio habet 'ab aptis natis' ....  
*A* (1008b11-12)<sup>46</sup>

'ab aptis natis' ?

The reading of the *alia littera*, 'ab aptis natis', may have its origin in a marginal addition or a marginal gloss similar to the one in Pd<sup>2</sup>: 'natis uel plantis *add. supra lin.*; uel a natis, id est aptis natis cogitare non cogitantibus *add. in marg.*'

659 iv.9

Et ita ... erimus liberati, uel remoti, a ratione, id est opinione, non mixta, id est non bene temperata; unde alia translatio habet 'distemperata'. *A* (1009a4)<sup>47</sup>

'distemperata' ?

For a reading similar to the *alia littera*: 'distemperata', see the reading in *B* [85rb]: 'intemperata'.

675 iv.11

... quia quanta ad alterationem transformant ... tanta eisdem semper curare inquit ... quod quidem est difficile. Alia translatio melius sic habet: 'quia quantumcumque mutati fiant, in tantum secundum ipsas semper sapere alia statutum est'. Vel 'ipsis affuit' secundum aliam litteram .... *A* (1009b20-21)<sup>48</sup>

'quia quantumcumque mutati fiant, in tantum secundum ipsas semper sapere alia statutum est'. ?

'ipsis affuit' ?

The origins of the *alia translatio* and the *alia littera* are unknown. However, the latter

(1015b36-1016a1) and *B* [110vL]; *M* (1017a31) and *B* [116vg]; *M* (1019a22-23) and *B* [121re]; *M* (1022b20-21) and *B* [133vk]; *M* (1033a2) and *B* [174vg]. There are two others to be noted: *C J* (999a15-16) and *B* [49vg]; *C J M* (1006a34) and *B* [76rb].

<sup>45</sup> See above, n. 20.

<sup>46</sup> See *A*: 'a plantis'; see also *M*: 'a natis'.

<sup>47</sup> See *A*: 'non mixta'; see also *M*: 'incondita'.

<sup>48</sup> See *A*: 'quia quanta alterant transformant, tanta eisdem semper curare difficile inquit'; see also *M*: 'quia quantum alteri transformati sunt, tantum ipsis et semper sapere altera affuit'.

may be an abbreviated version of the second half of the text of *M*: 'tantum ipsis et semper altera affuit'.<sup>49</sup>

## 1533 vii.11

... si ... est de primis .... Vel secundum aliam litteram 'quae prima est'. *A M* (1037b2-3)<sup>50</sup>

'quae prima est' ?

For a possible source of this *alia littera*, see MS. K (f. 58a): 'uel que si prima est'.

The following is an example of the nine *alia littera* whose origins are unknown:<sup>51</sup>

## 652 iv.9

... adhuc manifestum est quod entia se habebunt quo modo, id est aliquo modo,<sup>52</sup> determinate; unde alia translatio habet planius 'quodammodo'. *A* (1008b6)<sup>53</sup>

'quodammodo' ?

The origins of the *alia littera* not yet identified may never be discovered. Nevertheless, as noted previously, it has been speculated that many, if not all, of the unidentified *alia littera* may have their source in a part, now lost, of the *Translatio Iacobi*. Or, more precisely, as the editor of this translation has said: 'Il y a, de plus, une série de citations (nommées "alia translatio", "alia littera" etc.) dans le Commentaire de St. Thomas, qui, après le livre IV, ne sont identiques avec aucune traduction connue et qui peuvent indiquer une traduction perdue'.<sup>54</sup>

## THOMAS' PREFERENCE FOR MOERBEKE

It is apparent, from what has been said, that Thomas did not randomly cite the *alia littera*. Rather, these citations witness to his continuing attempt to discover and employ the best available translation of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*. This is evident not only from a study of his use of the *alia littera*,<sup>55</sup> but also from a comparison of his choice of *alia littera* in those parts of the commentary where *M* provides the text commented upon and in those parts where *A* provides the text commented upon.<sup>56</sup>

A comparison reveals the following: first, where *M* provides the text for Thomas' commentary, there are less than one half the number of *alia littera* than is the case when *A* provides the text, namely, twenty-three and fifty-four respectively.<sup>57</sup>

<sup>49</sup> See above, n. 48.

<sup>50</sup> See *A M*: 'si prima est'.

<sup>51</sup> See the appendix for the other *alia littera* whose origins are unknown.

<sup>52</sup> This is an example of an implicit citation in *B* [84rE] which is found nowhere else.

<sup>53</sup> See *A*: 'quomodo'; see also *M*: 'aliqua lter'.

<sup>54</sup> See Diem, 'Les traductions', 10.

<sup>55</sup> See below, pp. 569-76.

<sup>56</sup> See below, Table 2 and Table 3.

<sup>57</sup> In Table 3, fifty-eight *alia littera* are listed. Four, however, are excluded from this comparison, because they are the corresponding *alia littera* for the four isolated readings derived from *M*.

Secondly, where it exists and in proportion to the extent of its text, the translation *J* and/or *C* is the source of more *alia littera* than *A*. For example, five of the six *alia littera* in book III have their source in *J* and *C*.<sup>58</sup> Moreover, each of these *alia littera* contributes to a clearer understanding of the text Thomas is commenting upon, namely, *M*. Lastly, of the eighty-six *alia littera*, only twelve have their source in *A*.<sup>59</sup>

Comparable results may be drawn from an examination of the implicit citations. First, where *M* is the translation used by Aquinas, namely, books II, III, v.17 *ad fin.* VII, and VIII.8 *ad fin.* XII, there are some eighty-five implicit citations. Where *A* is the translation used, that is, books I, IV.7-v.16, and VIII.1-7, there are approximately the same number. However, given the respective lengths of the two translations used by Thomas, there are proportionately fewer implicit citations in those places where *M* rather than *A* is the text commented upon. Secondly, of some fifteen implicit citations in books II-III, eleven are from *J* and/or *C*; there are none from *A*. Finally, where *M* is the text commented upon, there are few implicit citations whose source is *A*. For example: from book v.17 *ad fin.* VII, there are some forty implicit citations. Of these, only five have *A* as their source.

It is evident, then, that Thomas prefers *M* to *A* and, where it exists, *J* to *A*. On the other hand, Thomas is always conscious that it is the responsibility of the commentator to insure that the text commented upon is accurate, clear and to the point. And so, even where *M* is the text commented upon, Thomas cites twenty-three *alia littera*, as well as many implicit citations, to insure the clarity and accuracy of the text on which he will comment. Similarly, where *J* and *A* are the texts commented upon, Thomas uses the *alia littera*, as well as the implicit citations, for the same purpose.

#### THOMAS' USE OF THE *ALIA LITTERA*

From a study of the particular context in which Thomas uses the *alia littera*, four types can be discerned: (1) some are simply synonymous or alternate readings; (2) others are explanatory in character; (3) fifteen of the *alia littera* are said to express better or more clearly (*melius uel planius*) the text of Aristotle as Thomas understands it; and (4) five *alia littera* are explicit corrections. Since the majority of the *alia littera* belong to types 1 and 2, it will be sufficient to give a limited sample of these. On the other hand, because of their significance, every *alia littera* of types 3 and 4 will be presented. Lastly, since in context the *alia littera* are self-explanatory, little commentary is necessary.

<sup>58</sup> See below, Table 2.

<sup>59</sup> See below, Table 1.

## TYPE 1

Some *alia littera* provide synonymous or alternate readings. For example:

## 111 I.5

Et hoc potest aliquis sumere ex elementis rerum ab ipso traditis, uel elementis, id est principiis, suae doctrinae quae posuit. Alia littera habet 'ex uersibus', quia dicitur metrice suam philosophiam scripsisse. Et huic concordat alia translatio quae dicit 'ex rationibus'. *A* (985b3)<sup>60</sup>

'ex uersibus' *M*

'ex rationibus' *C*

## 414 III.7

Sequitur ... quod geodaesia, uel geosophia, ut alii libri habent. *M* (997b32)<sup>61</sup>

'geosophia' *A*

## 614 IV.7

... nihil restat, siue differt, secundum aliquam translationem .... *A* (1006a34)<sup>62</sup>

'differt' *M*

## 676 IV.11

... sicut unusquisque habet dispositionem membrorum ualde circumflexorum uel multae flexionis, secundum aliam litteram .... *A* (1009b22-23)<sup>63</sup>

'multe flexionis' *M*

## TYPE 2

Some *alia littera* are explanatory in character. For example:

## 31 I.1

Quilibet autem inuentor artis habetur in admiratione propter hoc quod habet sensum .... Sed magis admiramur eum sicut sapientem, ab aliis distinguentem, sapientem quidem quantum ad subtilem inquisitionem causarum rei inuentae, distinguentem uero quantum ad inuestigationem differentiarum unius rei ad aliam. Vel aliter 'ab aliis distinguentem', ut passiuè legatur, quasi in hoc ab aliis distinguatur. Vnde alia littera habet 'differentem'. *A C* (981b16-17)<sup>64</sup>

'differentem ab aliis' *J M*

## 616 IV.7

Et quae uni et eidem sunt eadem sibi inuicem sunt eadem; unde sequeretur quod homo et lapis sint unum et unius rationis, et sic sequeretur quod omnia nomina sint

<sup>60</sup> See *A*: 'ex elementis'.

<sup>61</sup> See *M*: 'geodesia'.

<sup>62</sup> See *A*: 'restat'.

<sup>63</sup> See *A*: 'ualde circumflexorum'.

<sup>64</sup> See *A*: 'ab aliis distinguentem'.

uniuoca, id est unius rationis, uel synonyma, secundum aliam litteram, id est omnino idem significantia re-et ratione. *J C A* (1006b18)<sup>65</sup>

'synonyma' *M*

686 iv.11

Omne quod permutatur habet iam aliquid de termino ad quem permutatur, quia quod mutatur dum mutatur partim est in termino ad quem et partim in termino a quo ... uel, secundum aliam litteram, 'abiciens habet aliquid eius quod abicitur'. Et ex hoc datur intelligi quod in eo quod mouetur sit aliquid de termino a quo .... *A* (1010a18-19)<sup>66</sup>

'abiciens enim habet aliquid eius quod abicitur' *M*

728 iv.13

... quod negatio in quibusdam generibus inest loco contrariae differentiae uel, secundum aliam litteram, negatio infert contrarium, quia alterum contrariorum, quae necesse est esse in eodem genere, ex negatione rationem habet .... *A* (1012a9-10)<sup>67</sup>

'in quibuscumque generibus negatio contrarium infert, et in hiis erit' *M*

751 v.1

Et ideo dicit quod principium dicitur illud unde aliquis rem primo mouet, id est illa pars magnitudinis a qua incipit motus localis, uel, secundum aliam litteram, unde aliquis rei mouebitur primum, id est ex qua parte rei aliquis incipit primo moueri .... *A* (1012b34-35)<sup>68</sup>

'unde utique aliquid rei movebitur primum' *M*

### TYPE 3

Fifteen *alia littera* express better or more clearly (*melius uel planius*) the text of Aristotle as Thomas understands it. Of these fifteen *alia littera*, nine have their origin in *M*. They are:

650 iv.8

... et iterum ambo ea negat dicens quod neque ita neque non ita .... Si enim non omnia ista neget, sequitur quod ipse nouerit aliquid determinate quoniam uerum est, quod est contra positum, uel, secundum quod alia translatio habet, et planius: 'iam utique erit aliquid determinatum'. *A* (1008a34)<sup>69</sup>

'iam utique erit aliquid determinatum' *M*

675 iv.11

Nam nulla, scilicet prudentia, crescit in hominibus ad apparens, id est per hoc quod aliquid de noua incipit apparere homini nullus profectus scientiae in homine

<sup>65</sup> See *J*: 'univoca'.

<sup>66</sup> See *A*: 'nam permutans habet aliquid permutari'.

<sup>67</sup> See *A*: 'in quibusdam generibus negatio contrarium inest, in hiis erit'.

<sup>68</sup> See *A*: 'unde aliquis rem moueat primum'.

<sup>69</sup> See *A*: 'novit aliquid determinatum'.

aestimandus est, sed hoc fit per hoc quod dispositio corporis uariatur. Alia translatio melius habet: 'ad praesens enim uoluntas uel consilium augetur hominibus', quasi dicat: secundum diuersas dispositiones praesentes noua consilia siue nouae uoluntates siue nouae prouidentiae hominibus augentur .... *A* (1009b18-19)<sup>70</sup>

'ad praesens enim consilium augetur hominibus' *M*

676 iv.11

... quod idem est quod curat ... de membris ex natura membrorum et quod est in omnibus ... et quod est in omni .... Et sic hoc habet plus in homine quam in aliis partibus uniuersi quia in homine intelligit propter complexionem determinatam membrorum, non autem in aliis rebus .... Alia translatio planius habet sic: 'idem enim quod quidem sapit membrorum natura in hominibus et omnibus et omni; plus enim est intellectus'. *A* (1009b24-25)<sup>71</sup>

'idem enim est quod quidem sapit, membrorum natura hominibus et omnibus et omni; quod enim plus est intelligentia' *M*

692 iv.12

Sed de ueritate quod non omne apparens sit uerum ista considerata sunt. Quorum primum est quod sensus non est proprie causa falsitatis sed phantasia, quae non est idem sensui, quasi dicat: diuersitas iudiciorum quae dantur de sensibilibus non prouenit ex sensu sed ex phantasia .... Alia translatio melius habet sic: 'primum est quia neque sensus falsus proprii est, sed phantasia non idem est sensui', quasi dicat quod nullus sensus de proprio obiecto decipitur .... *A* (1010b2-3)<sup>72</sup>

'primum quidem quia neque sensus falsus proprii est, sed phantasia non idem sensui' *M*

774 v.2

... aliqua duo ad inuicem sibi sunt causae ... multipliciter dictis causis, sicut dolor excisione uulneris est causa sanitatis ut efficiens siue principium motus, sanitas autem est causa illius doloris ut finis .... Alia littera habet melius: 'laborare causa est euxiae', id est bonae dispositionis, quae causatur ex laborare moderato, qui ad digestionem confert et superfluos humores consumit. *A* (1013b9-10)<sup>73</sup>

'ut laborare causa est euxie et hec laborandi' *M*

808 v.4

... natura dicitur uno modo generatio generatorum, uel, ut alia littera habet melius, nascentium. Non enim omnia generata nascentia dici possunt, sed solum in uiuentibus .... *A* (1014b16)<sup>74</sup>

'Natura uero dicitur uno quidem modo nascentium generatio' *M*

<sup>70</sup> See *A*: 'nam ad apparens nulla crescit hominibus'.

<sup>71</sup> See *A*: 'idem enim est quod curat de membris et omnibus et omni; ad plus enim est intelligentia'.

<sup>72</sup> See *A*: 'primum quidem quod nec sensus falsus proprie est, sed phantasia, quae idem non est sensui'.

<sup>73</sup> See *A*: 'ut dolor causa est sanitatis et causa ea dolendi'.

<sup>74</sup> See *A*: 'Natura uero dicitur uno quidem modo generatorum generatio'.

813 v.4

Appositio autem augmentum faciens potest intelligi dupliciter: uno modo tangendo ... alio modo per hoc quod est insimul apte esse ... et adesse apte .... Loco autem huius alia littera habet melius 'connasci et adnasci'. In hac autem generatione uiuentium non solum fit appositio per tactum, sed etiam per quandam coaptationem siue connascentiam, ut patet in embryonibus .... *A* (1014b21)<sup>75</sup>

'et connasci aut adnasci, ut embria' *M*

895 v.7

... ponit alium modum entis, secundum quod 'esse' et 'est' significat compositionem propositionis, quam facit intellectus componens et diuidens. Vnde dicit quod esse significat ueritatem rei, uel, sicut alia translatio melius habet, quod esse significat quia aliquod dictum est uerum. *A* (1017a31)<sup>76</sup>

'esse et est significant quia uerum' *M*

1685 viii.1

Et quia definitio ratio est partes habens, necessarium erat determinare de partibus definitionis, quae scilicet sunt partes rei definitae et quae non, et utrum eadem sint definitionis et definiti, uel secundum aliam litteram, utrum partes definitionis oporteat definiri, et primum melius est. *M* (1042a20-21)<sup>77</sup>

'que substantie sunt partes et que non, et si easdem diffiniri oportet' *A*

These *alia littera* are self-explanatory and require little, if any comment, except perhaps for the last one. Here Thomas has reversed the usual procedure. He cites the *alia littera*, the translation of *A*, not as the better or clearer reading, but apparently to emphasize the superiority of the translation of *M*.

Of the six other *alia littera* of this type, three have their origin either in *J C* or *C*:

103

i.5

Quis autem horum sit prior in sententia, utrum ille qui dixit amorem esse primum principium uel ille qui dixit intellectum, posterius poterit iudicari, scilicet ubi agetur de Deo; et hoc iudicium distributionem uocat, quia per hoc unicuique suus gradus attribuitur dignitatis. Alia translatio planius habet: 'quomodo censere congruat quia de hoc sit prior posterius iudicari poterit'. *A* (984b31-32)<sup>78</sup>

'Hos quidem igitur quomodo censere congruat qui de hoc prior sit, diiudicare poteris posterius' *C*

440

iii.8

Et ex his tribus rationibus concludit propositum, scilicet quod species specilissimae, quae immediate de indiuiduis praedicantur, magis uidentur esse

<sup>75</sup> See *A*: 'et in simul apte esse et adesse apte ut embria'.

<sup>76</sup> See *A*: 'esse significat ueritatem rei'.

<sup>77</sup> See *M*: 'que substantie partes et que non, et si hee diffinitioni opus sunt'.

<sup>78</sup> See *A*: 'Hos quomodo oportet distribuere quis sit prior, posterius iudicare possibile sit'.

principia quam genera. Ponitur enim genitius 'genus' loco ablativi more Graecorum. Vnde littera Boethii planior est, quae expresse concludit huiusmodi praedicata magis esse principia quam genera. *MA* (999a15-16)<sup>79</sup>

'magis videntur in individuis predicantia principium esse quam genera' *J C*

#### 609-610 iv.7

Differt autem demonstrare principium praedictum et demonstrare argumentative, siue elenchice .... Sed quando demonstratio non erit talis, scilicet simpliciter, tunc erit argumentatio, siue elenchus,<sup>80</sup> et non demonstratio. Alia translatio sic habet, et melius: 'alterius autem cum huiusmodi causa sit, argumentatio erit, et non demonstratio' .... *A* (1006a17-18)<sup>81</sup>

'alterius autem cum huiusmodi causa sit argumentatio utique erit et non demonstratio' *J C*

The origins of two of the three remaining *alia littera* of this type are completely unknown.<sup>82</sup> Although its origin is uncertain, the third *alia littera* has been found in the margins of several manuscripts which have the translation of Moerbeke.<sup>83</sup>

#### TYPE 4

There are five places where Thomas notes that some word or words of translation *A* are in error. In all five places, Thomas cites *M* as the correct translation. The most interesting of the corrections is the following:

#### 858 v.6

Sciendum autem quod littera quae habet 'curuitatem' loco reflexionis falsa est. Constat enim quod partes lineae curuae angulum non continentes oportet quod simul moueantur et simul quiescant sicut et partes lineae rectae; quod non accidit in reflexa, ut dictum est.

These lines occur in a passage at the beginning of the second dictated part in MS. N.<sup>84</sup> This passage is a second redaction of an earlier version which the entire manuscript tradition carries, with the exception of MSS. M and the first hand of N.<sup>85</sup> The relevant lines in the first redaction are:

<sup>79</sup> See *MA*: 'magis videntur que de individuis sunt predicata esse principia generum'.

<sup>80</sup> This is an example of an implicit citation in *M*.

<sup>81</sup> See *A*: 'sed nec talis existens argumentatio erit et non demonstratio'; see also *M*: 'sed nec tali existente causa elenchus utique erit et non demonstratio'.

<sup>82</sup> See above, p. 567: 675, iv.11 and p. 568: 652, iv.9.

<sup>83</sup> See above, p. 565: 1344, vii.4.

<sup>84</sup> For a discussion of the dictated text in MS. N, see J. Cos, 'Evidences of St. Thomas's Dictating Activity in the Naples Manuscript of His *Scriptum in Metaphysicam* (Naples BN VIII F. 16)', *Scriptorium* 38 (1984) 231-53. The text cited is found in MS. N (fol. 43ra).

<sup>85</sup> MS. M: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm. 15836, fols. 1ra-134rb. The second hand of N (fol. 42v) has the earlier version in the lower margin. For a comparison of the two redactions, see the Preface of the forthcoming Leonine edition of the *Sententia libri Metaphysicae*.



Alia translatio habet melius, loco curuitatis, reflexum. Nam linea recta non est magis una quam curua, sed est magis una quam reflexa continens angulum, sicut tibia et femur.

It is evident that Thomas, when revising the first version, decided that in light of the context, the word 'curuitas', found in translation *A*, was false,<sup>86</sup> and the word 'reflexum', found in translation *M*, was correct.<sup>87</sup>

The other corrections are:

808 v.4

Non autem generatio rerum non uiuentium potest dici natura proprie loquendo secundum communem usum uocabuli, sed solum generatio uiuentium, ut dicatur natura ipsa natiuitas uel ipsa nascentia, quod ipsum nomen sonare uidetur, ut si quis porrigens dicat naturam. Littera ista corrupta est; quod ex alia translatione patet, quae sic habet 'ut si quis produciens dicat ipsum y'. Phisis enim quod apud Graecos naturam significat, si pro generatione uiuentium accipitur, habet primum 'i' productum; si uero pro principio, sicut communiter utimur, habet primum 'i' breue. Posset tamen per hanc litteram intelligi quod hoc nomen 'natura' de generatione uiuentium dicatur secundum quamdam porrectionem, id est extensionem.

In this passage Thomas compares the reading of translation *A*: 'ut si quis porrigens dicat naturam', with the reading in the first redaction of *M*: 'ut si quis produciens dicat ipsum y'. He concludes that the reading of *A* has been corrupted. However, he does concede that the reading of *A* is in some sense compatible with the reading of the second redaction of *M*: 'ut si quis extendens dicat le y'.<sup>88</sup>

811 v.4

Et quia de nascentibus mentionem fecit, ostendit quid sit proprie nasci, ut habet alia littera, loco cuius haec littera habet improprie 'generari'. Differt enim generatio in uiuentibus a generatione inanimatorum, quia inanimatum generatur non ut coniunctum siue unitum generanti, sicut ignis ab igne et aqua ab aqua; in uiuentibus autem fit generatio per quamdam unionem ad generationis principium.

'Nasci', the reading of *M* (1014b20), is the appropriate reading because Aristotle is speaking of the generation of living things. 'Generari', the reading of *A*, is inappropriate because it refers to the generation of inanimate things.

940 v.16

Quaedam uero dicuntur priora quia sunt affinia, uel propinquiora, ipsi nunc, sicut dicitur quod prius est Menelaus Pyrrho quia propinquus est alicui nunc praesenti,

<sup>86</sup> See *A* (1016a9-11): 'Que vero omnino sunt continua unum dicuntur quamvis curuitatem habeant, amplius magis que non habent curuitatem'.

<sup>87</sup> See *M* (1016a9-11): 'Que itaque omnino sunt continua unum dicuntur quamvis reflexionem habeant, et adhuc magis que non habent reflexionem'.

<sup>88</sup> See Vuillemin-Diem, 'Recensio Palatina und Recensio Vulgata', 363; see also *M* (1014b17) *apparatus criticus* (n. 94).

respectu cuius utrumque erat futurum. Videtur tamen haec littera esse falsa, quia utrumque erat praeteritum tempore Aristotelis, quando haec sunt conscripta. In greco autem habetur quod prius est Nemea Pythion, quae quidem erant duo festa uel duae nundinae, quorum unum erat propinquius illi nunc in quo haec conscripta sunt, cum tamen utrumque esset futurum.

The reading of *A* (1018b18): 'prius enim Menelaus Pirro', is false because both lived before the time of Aristotle, when these words were written. The reading of *M*: 'prius enim Nemea Pythion', corresponds to the Greek text and meets more readily the requirements of the argument.

### 1103 v.31

Et ideo dicit quod oportet partes inesse toti, maxime quidem in potentia, sicut in toto continuo; et si non in potentia, saltem energia, id est in actu; dicitur enim energia interior actio. Licet autem magis sit totum quando partes sunt in eo in potentia quam quando sunt actu, tamen si respiciamus ad partes magis sunt partes, quando sunt in actu quam quando sunt in potentia. Vnde alia littera habet 'maxime quidem perfectione', id est actu, 'sin autem et potestate', et subiungit etiam quod prius dictum est, scilicet 'et maxime potestate, sin autem et energia'. Vnde uidetur quod translator duas inuenerit litteras et utramque transtulit, et errore factum sit ut coniungantur ambae quasi una littera. Et hoc patet ex alia translatione, quae non habet nisi alterum tantum; sic enim dicit: 'continuum autem et finitum est cum unum aliquod fit ex pluribus inhaerentibus, maxime quidem potentia, si autem non, actu sunt'.

The reading of *A* (1023b33-34): 'maxime quidem perfectione, sin autem et potestate, sin vero et maxima potestate, sin autem et energia', is, as Thomas notes, a conflation of two versions of the text. This is evident from the reading of *M*: 'maxime quidem potentia, si autem non et energia'.

\*  
\* \*

From the present account, it seems to be the case that Thomas' choice of alternative readings, whether implicit or explicit (the *alia littera*), was not the result of random selection. Rather, as a commentator on Aristotle, Thomas' major concern was to clarify what he understood the intention of Aristotle to be. To do this, he paid particular attention to difficult passages in the text, citing different translations, both explicitly and implicitly, so as to avoid real or apparent contradictions. In other instances, however, he cited an *alia littera* simply because it seemed to fit the context better than the particular translation he was commenting upon.<sup>89</sup>

It is true that the sources for many of the *alia littera* and the implicit citations were the marginal or interlinear notes in those manuscripts accessible to Thomas

<sup>89</sup> For example, see 709, iv.12, which reads: 'Alia littera habet "quoniam non persuasi sunt"; et est sententia conuenientior premissis'.

which carried the different Latin translations. In all of this, however, one thing is clear. Thomas consistently preferred the *Translatio Moerbecana* to any translation, particularly the *Translatio anonyma*. Whenever Moerbeke's translation was available, Thomas used it as the basis for his commentary, and for the majority of the *alia littera*.

In another context, citing the Philosopher, Thomas observed that a small error in the beginning can lead eventually to a greater error.<sup>90</sup> A similar concern, namely, to avoid, as far as possible, an erroneous interpretation of Aristotle, seems to have governed Thomas' choice of translations as well as his use of both the *alia littera* and the implicit citations in the *Sententia libri Metaphysicae*.<sup>91</sup>

# TABLES

## 1

This table lists the *alia littera* according to their occurrence in the text. Included in this table are the following: (1) the location of the *alia littera* according to book and chapter of the critical text of Thomas' commentary on the *Metaphysics*. However, because this text is not yet printed, the relevant line numbers in each chapter cannot be given; instead the appropriate paragraph number in the 1964 Marietti edition of this commentary is given for each of the *alia littera*. (2) The translation Thomas is commenting upon is given, including the corresponding Bekker number, where the *alia littera* occurs. (3) If known, the source of the *alia littera* is given. The following letters identify the different translations: *A* (*anonyma*), *C* (*composita*), *J* (*Iacobi*), *M* (*Moerbecana*) and *S* (*Scoti*). Others symbols used are: *x* (the *alia littera* is found in one or more of the manuscripts which carry the *Translatio Moerbecana*); *B* (the *alia littera* is now found only in the Bessarion translation); ? (the source of the *alia littera* is unknown or doubtful). These letters and symbols are also used in Tables 2 and 3 and throughout the text.

	Location	Translation	Source
Book I	23	AC (981a26-27)	M
			J
	31	AC (981b16-17)	JM
	33	AC (981b22-23)	M
	72	M (983b4)	C
			A
	99	A (984b14-15)	M

<sup>90</sup> See *De ente et essentia*, prol. (Leonine edition 43.369:1-2).

<sup>91</sup> This article could not have been undertaken without the research on this topic by the late Maximiano del Pozo, O.P., a former member of the American section of the Leonine Commission. The author of the present article wishes to acknowledge his indebtedness to his former colleague.

	<i>Location</i>	<i>Translation</i>	<i>Source</i>
	103	A (984b31-32)	C
	107	A (985a15-18)	J
	111	A (985b3)	M
			C
	209	A (990b6-8)	J
Book III	414	M (997b32)	A
	440	MA (999a15-16)	JC
	475	MA (1000b2-3)	JC
	476	MA (1000b8-9)	JC
	479	MA (1000b14-16)	JC
	486	MA (1005b4-5)	JC
Book IV.1-6	594	JC (1005b4-5)	A
	598	AM (1005b14)	JC
	609-610	A (1006a17-18)	JC
	614	A (1006a34)	JCM
Book IV.7-13	616	A (1006b18)	M
	642	AM (1008a11-12)	B [82vL]
	646	A (1008a22)	M
	648	A (1008a28)	M
	650	A (1008a34)	M
	652	M (1008b4-5)	A
	652	A (1008b6)	?
	653	A (1008b7-9)	?
			?
	653	A (1008b11-12)	?M
	659	A (1009a4)	?B [85rB]
	663	A (1009a17)	x
	675	A (1009b18-19)	M
	675	A (1009b20-21)	?
			?M
	676	A (1009b22-23)	M
	676	A (1009b24-25)	M
	678	A (1009b30)	M
	678	A (1009b30-31)	M
	680	A (1009b37-38)	M
	684	A (1010a11)	M
	684	A (1010a13)	M
	686	A (1010a18-19)	M
	692	A (1010b2-3)	M
	694	A (1010b4)	M
	708	A (1011a3-4)	M
	709	A (1011a10)	M

	<i>Location</i>	<i>Translation</i>	<i>Source</i>
Book v.1-16	728	A (1012a9-10)	M
	742	A (1012b13-15)	?
	751	A (1012b34-35)	M
	774	A (1013b9-10)	M
	805	A (1014b10)	M
	808	A (1014b16)	M
	808	A (1014b17)	M
	811	A (1014b20)	M
	813	A (1014b21)	M
	814	A (1014b22)	M
	817	A (1014b27-28)	?
	819	A (1015a1-2)	?
	829	M (1015a26-27)	A
	849	A (1015b36-1016a1)	M
	858	A (1016a10)	M
	895	A (1017a31)	M
Book v.17-36	940	A (1018b18)	M
	944	A (1018b27-28)	x
	957-958	A (1019a22-23)	x
	991-992	MA (1020b6)	x
	1062	M (1022b6)	A
	1068	M (1022b20-21)	A
			x
	1103	M (1023b33-34)	A
	1109	M (1024a11)	S [139rB]
			x
Book vi	1149-50	M (1025b11)	A
	1173	MA (1026b4-5)	?
Book vii	1344	MA (1030b16-20)	x
	1391-93	M (1032a24)	A
	1413	MA (1033a2)	M
	1533	MA (1037b2-3)	?M
	1647	M (1041a5)	A
	1654	M (1041a20)	?
			A
Book viii	1685	M (1042a20-21)	A
Book ix	1770-72	M (1045b35-1046a1)	S [225vk]

## 2

This table gives the *alia littera* for those places where the *Moerbecana* is the text commented upon.

	<i>Location</i>	<i>Translation</i>	<i>Source</i>
Book III	414	M (997b32)	A
	440	MA (999a15-16)	JC
	475	M (1000b2-3)	JC
	476	MA (1000b8-9)	JC
	479	MA (1000b14-16)	JC
	486	MA (1001a2-3)	JC
Book v.17-36	991-992	MA (1020b6)	x
	1062	M (1022b6)	A
	1068	M (1022b20-21)	A
			x
	1103	M (1023b34)	A
	1109	M (1024a11)	S [139rb]
			x
Book VI	1149-50	M (1025b11)	A
	1173	MA (1026b4-5)	?
Book VII	1344	MA (1030b16-20)	x
	1391-93	M (1032a24)	A
	1413	MA (1033a2)	M
	1533	MA (1037b2-3)	x
	1647	M (1041a5)	A
	1654	M (1041a20)	?
			A
Book IX	1170-72	M (1045b35-1046a1)	S [225vk]

## 3

This table gives the *alia littera* for those places where the *anonyma* is the text commented upon. In four instances, however, *M* supplies the particular reading for which *alia littera* are given.

	<i>Location</i>	<i>Translation</i>	<i>Source</i>
Book I	23	AC (981a26-27)	M
			J
	31	AC (981b16-17)	JM
	33	AC (981b22-23)	M

	<i>Location</i>	<i>Translation</i>	<i>Source</i>
	72	M (983b4)	C
			A
	99	A (984b14-15)	M
	103	A (984b31-32)	C
	107	A (985a15-18)	J
	111	A (985b3)	M
			C
	209	A (990b6-8)	J
Book iv.7-13	616	A (1006b18)	M
	642	AM (1008a11-12)	B [82vL]
	646	A (1008a22)	M
	648	A (1008a28)	M
	650	A (1008a34)	M
	652	M (1008b4-5)	A
	652	A (1008b6)	?
	653	A (1008b7-9)	?
			?
	653	A (1008b11-12)	?M
	659	A (1009a4)	?B [85rB]
	663	A (1009a17)	?
	675	A (1009b18-19)	M
	675	A (1009b20-21)	?
			?M
	676	A (1009b22-23)	M
	676	A (1009b24-25)	M
	678	A (1009b30)	M
	678	A (1009b30-31)	M
	680	A (1009b37-38)	M
	684	A (1010a11)	M
	684	A (1010a13)	M
	686	A (1010a18-19)	M
	692	A (1010b2-3)	M
	694	A (1010b4)	M
	708	A (1011a3-4)	M
	709	A (1011a10)	M
	728	A (1012a9-10)	M
	742	A (1012b13-15)	?
Book v.1-17	751	A (1012b34-35)	M
	774	A (1013b9-10)	M
	805	A (1014b10)	M
	808	A (1014b16)	M
	808	A (1014b17)	M

<i>Location</i>	<i>Translation</i>	<i>Source</i>
811	A (1014b20)	M
813	A (1014b21)	M
814	A (1014b22)	M
817	A (1014b27-28)	?
819	A (1015a1-2)	?
829	M (1015a26-27)	A
849	A (1015b36-1016a1)	M
858	A (1016a10)	M
895	A (1017a31)	M
940	A (1018b18-19)	M
944	A (1018b27-28)	x
957-958	A (1019a22-23)	x

## APPENDIX

The following is a list of the other unknown *alia littera*.

## 653 IV.9

Sed si omnes praedicti ... mentiuntur et omnes etiam uerum dicunt, tali qui hoc ponit non est disputandum nec aliquid dicendum ut disputetur cum eo; uel, secundum aliam translationem, talis homo neque asserit aliquid neque affirmat. Sicut enim alia translatio dicit, nec asserere nec dicere aliquid huiusmodi est .... A (1008b7-9)

‘talis homo neque asserit aliquid neque affirmat’ ?

‘nec asserere nec dicere aliquid huiusmodi est’ ?

(See A: ‘Sed si similiter et omnes mentiuntur et uera dicunt, nec pronuntiandum nec dicendum est tali’.)

## 675 IV.11

v. *supra* p. 568

## 742 IV.3

Ad omnes praedictas orationes ... contingit hoc inconueniens quod se ipsas destruunt. Et hoc est famatum, id est famosum, ab omnibus dictum; unde alia translatio habet: ‘accidit autem et id uulgare’. A (1012b13-15)

‘Accidit autem et id uulgare’ ?

(See A: ‘Contingit etiam quod est firmatum omnibus talibus orationibus se ipsas destruere’; see also M: ‘accidit itaque et quod famatum est de omnibus talibus orationibus ipsas se ipsas destruere’.)



817 v.4

... quia materia essendi et fiendi principium est ex quo, dico existente inordinato ...  
unde alia translatio habet 'cum informe sit' .... *A M* (1014b27-28)

'cum informe sit' ?

(See *A*: 'inordinato existente'.)

819 v.4

... quod natura non est aliquid entium absolutum, sed solum permixtio et relaxatio,  
uel comminutio permixtorum, secundum aliam translationem .... *A* (1015a1-2)

'comminutio mixtorum' ?

(See *A*: 'permixtio et relaxatio'.)

1173 vi.2

... quia nulla scientia, quantumcumque sit studiosa, aut meditativa, ut alia translatio  
habet ... eorum quae ad ipsam pertinent .... *MA* (1026b4-5)

'meditativa' ?

(See *MA*: 'studiosa'.)

1654 vii.15

... quia unumquodque est indiuisibile ad se ipsum et est quod breue .... Alia translatio  
habet: 'et est similis toni' .... Alia uero littera habet: 'et est uerum' .... *M* (1041a20)

'et est similis toni' ?

'et est uerum' *A*

(See *M*: 'et quod breue'.)

## A SECOND NEW LIST OF BENEVENTAN MANUSCRIPTS (II)

Virginia Brown

PART I of 'A Second New List of Beneventan Manuscripts' appeared in vol. 40 (1978) of this journal with the full expectation that future discoveries of hitherto unrecorded Beneventan specimens would eventually require another instalment. The present article shows that expectation to have been amply justified. In the intervening decade approximately 300 more new items have been located.

The new representatives all concern liturgy (taken in a broad sense) except for the Orosius leaves in San Francisco and three medical texts now at Girona and Oporto, and most of them consist of fragments. Indeed, their number includes only four substantial codices, namely, a Homiliarium (Naples VIII AA 3), Jerome's commentary on Ezechiel (Naples VI C 3), the 'Kalendarium Tutinianum' (Geneva Comites latentes 195), and an anonymous commentary on Matthew (Venosa 1). But the mere fact of large numbers of fragments is important as well as tantalizing proof of manuscripts which once existed. Moreover, many of these fragments once served as covers for volumes now in state archives (e.g., at Frosinone and Foggia) or in church archives (at Altamura and Sala Consilina). Such indications of provenance as may be gleaned from the notarial entries made on the Beneventan fragments themselves, if they are not wholly the result of chance, may testify to Beneventan scriptoria in areas of the Beneventan zone not previously known to contain such centres. At the same time, the essentially homogeneous contents of the new witnesses continues to attest the preeminent use to which the Beneventan hand was put: it is a liturgical script *par excellence*.

So far as date is concerned, the oldest item is from the ninth century (see below under San Francisco), and the latest is a seemingly fifteenth-century leaf at Dubrovnik. As is only natural, Italy preserves by far the largest number of new Beneventan specimens; it is not surprising that Yugoslavia also has many such items. The remaining representatives are scattered all over the world, with two fragments now in Japan.

Descriptions of the new items follow below and exhibit the format used for Part I. It is helpful to recall that height is always noted first in measurements and that measurements in parentheses are those of the written space; in the case of a bifolium, maximum measurements are given for a single leaf. The number of text lines has been counted for items with neums. There are, however, some differences

in the present descriptions: when possible, the contents are identified more fully (with a view towards the eventual reunion of numerous *membra disiecta*, a project in which I am presently engaged); more information, if known, is given about the printed books and archival sources from which fragments have been removed (in the hope that this will be useful in determining their origin or history); all dates assigned are my own.

On the always delicate matter of date a few observations are in order. E. A. Lowe originally believed Beneventan to disappear by the end of the thirteenth century; while discoveries of obviously later manuscripts convinced him many years after to extend the use of Beneventan to the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, he never reformulated his original principles and criteria of dating to take into account this later period. Now Beneventan is known to have been practiced in the sixteenth century. All of this has some bearing on the palaeographical evidence used to date a Beneventan specimen since Lowe, in accord with his earlier statements, was obliged to accommodate within the twelfth and thirteenth centuries codices whose script, ornamentation etc. might more plausibly suggest a date in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Clearly, then, more work needs to be done to establish sound criteria for the dating of late manuscripts.

The present article, by its very nature, cannot pretend to offer a solution. Certainly these problems are compounded for the new items assembled here; as Lowe pointed out long ago, fragments in Beneventan script are notoriously difficult to date. It would be unfair, however, to the reader not to bring such problems to his attention since they have had an impact on the dates given below. Keeping in mind the long and varied life enjoyed by Beneventan, I have in many instances proposed a somewhat later date than might perhaps be assigned by other scholars. In a few cases such as the Rab evangelistary, where new fragments are plainly *membra disiecta* of items already known to Lowe, I have even suggested another date when I believe them to have been copied later. In this connection it should be noted that the many new fragments from Yugoslavia testify to a complex situation as regards dating and nomenclature. Beneventan seems to have been used in Dalmatia well past the thirteenth century and to have exhibited a variety of forms, only one of which was the round 'Bari type'.

Needless to say, the dates suggested for the new items lay no claim to infallibility. They, in their turn, will doubtless need modification when more Beneventan specimens are found and other pieces of the jigsaw puzzle filled in. I shall welcome corrections of any kind to the descriptions given below as well as information concerning items not now known to me. I list now those items reported to be in Beneventan for which no confirmation or further information is currently available:

Corfinio, Archivio Capitolare Valense: S. N. Graduale cum sequentiis (ss. Martini-Clementis). Saec. XII. A bifolium, comprising fols. 144 and 149 in a register. (*A. Ziino*)

- Korčula, Opatska knjižnica/Zupa sv. Marka: Ink. 9. 2 fragments (Liturgica) in Beneventan are pasted to the inside cover of a printed book (Seneca, *Opera philosophica*, Treviso, 1478). (*B. Pecarski, Š. Jurić*)
- Leningrad, Hermitage Museum: OP 21. Ordo Romanus in Beneventan. (*P. Konakov, R. F. Gyug*)
- Monopoli, Archivio Unico Diocesano: D 39. Fols. 20-21 are palimpsest; the lower script is Beneventan, Bari type. Cf. G. Bellifemine, 'The Bari Hymnary', *Monumenta Apuliae ac Japygiae* 1 (1981) 71 n. 5.
- Split, Dominikanski samostan: Ink. 9. Beneventan fragments are used in the binding of a printed book (Themistius Peripateticus, *Paraphrasis in Aristotelem*, Venice, 1499). (*Š. Jurić*)

Of course it would not have been possible to compile the many items contained in the present list if scholars, librarians and friends had not generously and assiduously shared with me their discoveries of new items. They have also communicated addenda (including new fragments) and corrigenda for manuscripts already cited in the second edition of E. A. Loew's *The Beneventan Script*, and this information is found in the Appendix on pp. 622-25 below. To all of them I am most grateful; the citation of their names after the items which they have contributed shows the extent of my indebtedness. I should like to acknowledge as well the extraordinary help given by Prof. Guglielmo Cavallo, dott.ssa Rita Cosma, dott. Francesco Lo Monaco, Dr. Richard F. Gyug, Prof. James Hankins, Prof. Thomas Forrest Kelly, Dom Jean Mallet, O.S.B., Prof. Francis Newton, dott. Stefano Palmieri, and Dom André Thibaut, O.S.B.

A General Research Grant from the Humanities and Social Sciences Committee of the Research Board of the University of Toronto enabled me to examine *in situ* many Beneventan items in Italian libraries.

\* \* \*

The following abbreviations are used throughout for bibliographical references:

- |            |  |
|------------|--|
| Barré      | = H. Barré, <i>Les homéliaires carolingiens de l'école d'Auxerre</i> (Studi e testi 225; Vatican City, 1962).  |
| B.H.L.     | = <i>Bibliotheca hagiographica latina antiquae et mediae aetatis</i> , 3 vols. (Subsidia hagiographica 6, 12; Brussels, 1898-1911).  |
| Brown      | = V. Brown, 'A Second New List of Beneventan Manuscripts (I)', <i>Mediaeval Studies</i> 40 (1978) 239-89.  |
| Cenci 1, 2 | = C. Cenci, <i>Manoscritti francescani della Biblioteca Nazionale di Napoli</i> , 2 vols. (Quaracchi-Grottaferrata, 1971).   |
| Chevalier  | = U. Chevalier, <i>Repertorium hymnologicum. Catalogue des chants, hymnes, proses, séquences, tropes en usage dans l'église latine depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours</i> , 6 vols. (Louvain, 1892-1920). |

- Lowe = E. A. Lowe, 'A New List of Beneventan Manuscripts' in *Collectanea vaticana in honorem Anselmi M. Card. Albareda a Bibliotheca Apostolica edita* (Studi e testi 220; Vatican City, 1962), pp. 211-44 and 6 plates.
- Mallet-Thibaut = J. Mallet-A. Thibaut, *Les manuscrits en écriture bénéventaine de la Bibliothèque Capitulaire de Bénévent 1* (Paris, 1984).
- Pecarski = B. Pecarski, *Beneventanski skriptoriji i slikarstvo u Dalmaciji od 11-tog do 13-tog veka* (Diss. Belgrade, 1965).
- Supino Martini = P. Supino Martini, *Roma e l'area grafica romanesca (secoli X-XII)* (Biblioteca di Scrittura e civiltà 1; Alessandria, 1987).
- The Beneventan Script* = E. A. Loew, *The Beneventan Script. A History of the South Italian Minuscule*, vol. 2: *Hand List of Beneventan MSS.*, 2nd edition prepared and enlarged by V. Brown (Rome, 1980).

## ALTAMURA

**Archivio Capitolare: Fondo pergameneo, cassetto A** (various fragments).  
(*G. Pupillo, T. F. Kelly*)

**Busta 1.** De Septuagesima; Termini quadragesimales. Saec. XI/XII. A bifolium (the innermost of the quire), 225 x 155 (170 x 95) mm., 21 long lines. Formerly serving as the cover of a 'Registro di amministrazione S. N. for 1563-64'. Cf. H. F. Holbrook, 'Beneventan Fragments at Altamura', *Mediaeval Studies* 49 (1987) 466-71 and pls. 7-10 (complete facsimile).

**Busta 2.** Breviarium, with neums (Quinquag.). Saec. XII. Bari type. 1 folio, trimmed, 330 x 200 (250 x 125) mm., 32 long lines. Formerly serving as the cover of the 'Registro conti Fabbriceria Assunta, Armadio A, n. 5' (= 'Registro di amministrazione 3 for 1521'). Cf. T. F. Kelly, 'Beneventan Fragments at Altamura', *Mediaeval Studies* 49 (1987) 472-74 and pls. 11-12 (recto and verso).

**Busta 3.** Missale, with neums (Dom. 1-3 p. Epiph.). Saec. XIII. Bari type. A bifolium, 380 x 310 (250 x 160) mm., 2 cols., 27 lines. Formerly serving as the cover of the 'Registro conti Fabbriceria Assunta, Armadio A, n. 12' (= 'Registro di amministrazione 10 for 1526'). Cf. Kelly, *ibid.*, 474-79 and pls. 13-16 (complete facsimile).

## ANDRIA

**Biblioteca del Seminario: S. N.** *In an antiphonary in Gothic writing saec. XV/XVI there is an offset between fols. 130v and 131r of 10 lines (Missale [Fer. 6 in Parasc.]) in Beneventan saec. XI/XII, Bari type.* (B. Baroffio, J. Mallet)

## AQUILA

**Biblioteca del Convento di s. Giuliano: Incunabulo I/B/6**, front fly-leaves. Graduale (Oct. Apost.-Transfig.). Saec. XII. 2 consecutive folios, trimmed, 214 x 175 mm., 10 long musical lines. The main text contains *Compendium theologicæ veritatis* (Venice, 1492); on the title-page is the ex-libris 'Iste liber pertinet ad locum sancti Nicolai de sulmone'. Presently (March 1988) on display in the museum (showcase no. 1) of the Convento di s. Giuliano. (*A. Ziino*)

### Biblioteca Provinciale 'Salvatore Tommasi'

**69**, front fly-leaf. Psalterium (97:9-100:5). Saec. XII ex. A fragment, 184 x 66 mm., parts of 21 of an estimated original 22 lines surviving. The main text contains a Hymnarium in ordinary minuscule saec. XII (?). (*W. Capezzali*)

**129**, cover. Gregorius Magnus, Homiliae in evangelia 15.1-5. Saec. XI. 2 consecutive damaged and mutilated folios, c. 235 x (max.) 270 mm., 2 cols. (width of 1 col. c. 85 mm.), c. 20 of an estimated original 24 lines surviving. The main text consists of two manuscripts containing various works by Franciscan authors in Gothic cursive saec. XV. Cf. Cenci 1.49-50. (*V. Brown*)

## ATHENS

**Alexandra Vouvoussiras Collection: S. N. Vetus Testamentum** (Prov 27:9-28:17; Eccli 5:10-7:11). Saec. XI. A mutilated and damaged bifolium (the outermost of the quire), 327 x 190 (254 x 128) mm., 27 long lines. Acquired c. 1965 by Josef Diener and given by him to the present owner in 1982. (*J. Diener, A. Vouvoussiras*)

## AUGSBURG

**Stadtarchiv: ms. Schätze 202**, front and back fly-leaves. The main text contains a Missale plenum (of Dalmatian origin, most probably Pola) in Gothic writing saec. XIV. Cf. R. Kottje, 'Beneventana-Fragmente liturgischer Bücher im Stadtarchiv Augsburg', *Mediaeval Studies* 47 (1985) 432-37 and 2 plates (Graduale, verso; Lectionarium, fol. 1r).

(i) Graduale (Dom. 21-23 p. Pent.). Saec. XIII. 1 folio, now serving as the front fly-leaf, 320 x 217 (250 x 155) mm., 10 long lines.

(ii) Lectionarium (Feria 4 p. Oct. Pasch.-Feria 6 p. Dom. 1 Oct. Pasch.). Saec. XII. A bifolium, now serving as the back fly-leaves, 320 x 224 (285 x 180) mm., 2 cols., 24 lines.

## AVELLINO

**Archivio di Stato: S. N. Augustinus, Enarrationes in psalmos 46:12-47:2**. Saec.

X/XI. 1 mutilated folio, badly rubbed on one side, 283 x 373 (width 280) mm., 2 cols., 29 lines surviving. (*F. Newton*)

## AVERSA

**Archivio Capitolare della Chiesa Cattedrale S. Paolo: Cod. 1, fol. 1.** Breviarium, with neums (s. Iohannis ev.). Saec. XIII. 238 x 165 (163 x 127) mm., 26 long lines. The main text contains an Ordinarium in Gothic writing saec. XIV. (*E. Rascato, M. dell'Omo*)

## AVEZZANO

### Archivio Diocesano dei Marsi

- 50/T** (formerly **TRASACCO, Archivio parrocchiale di s. Cesidio S. N.**). Liturgica, with neums (Jer 2:15, 17-18). Saec. XII (?). Upper portion of a badly damaged folio (legible on one side only), formerly used as a cover of a 'Censuale' saec. XVI of the church of s. Cesidio: 203 x 252 (c. 170 x c. 190) mm., 2 cols., 8 lines surviving. Cf. A. Clementi et al., *I fondi pergameneo e cartaceo dell'Archivio della Collegiata di s. Cesidio di Trasacco* (Documenti per la storia d'Abruzzo 6; L'Aquila, 1984), p. 1. Transferred in 1984 from Trasacco to its present location. (*E. Angelini*)
- 53/T** (formerly **TRASACCO, Archivio parrocchiale di s. Cesidio S. N.**). Vita s. Eugeniae (B.H.L. 2667). Saec. XI in. A bifolium (only a tiny stub, with the beginnings of 9 lines of an unidentified text, remains of one leaf), 319 x 260 (250 x 196) mm., 2 cols., 32 lines. Cf. Clementi et al., *ibid.*, pp. 2-5. Transferred in 1984 from Trasacco to its present location. (*E. Angelini*)

## BAMBERG

**Staatsbibliothek: Msc. Class. 34** (formerly **M IV 8**). *Livius, Ab urbe condita libri 1-7 in ordinary minuscule saec. IX<sup>2</sup>. On fol. 15r there are two brief marginal entries ('octuagin' and 'septuagin') in Beneventan saec. X which give the written equivalents of Roman numerals in the text (at 1.43.1 and 1.43.4 respectively). Cf. G. Billanovich, 'La biblioteca papale salvò le storie di Livio', Studi petrarcheschi N. S. 3 (1986) 5, 8. (G. Billanovich)*

## BARI

### Archivio di S. Nicola

- 4.** Missale Romanum, with neums in Gothic writing saec. XIV. A tiny scrap (33 x 30 mm., parts of 2 lines) of an Antiphonale in Beneventan saec. XII (?) has been used to repair the outer edge of fol. 55r (2 scraps on fol. 75r exhibit traces of neums and guides but no writing); another scrap (33 x 36 mm., part of 1 line), formerly in ms. 4, became detached in 1986 and is now kept separately. Also used for purposes of repair on fols. 105r,

116v, 117v, 134v-135r, 135v-136r are scraps of Homiliae (?) in Beneventan saec. XII, the largest of which measure (fol. 105r) 28 x 26 mm., parts of 4 lines, (fol. 116v) 29 x 36 mm., 2 cols., parts of 4 lines, and (fols. 135v-136r) 50 x 66 mm., parts of 7 lines. (*B. Baroffio, J. Mallet*)

8. Missale Romanum in Gothic writing, saec. XIV. A tiny scrap, Liturgica, with neums in Beneventan saec. XII (?), has been used to repair the binding at the top of ff. 197v-198r. Another scrap from a different codex in Beneventan saec. XI ex. (?) is visible (parts of 5 lines) at the bottom of f. 197v. (Accurate measurements could not be determined because of the tightness of the binding). (*B. Baroffio*)

### Biblioteca Nazionale

- 70 O 1/1-2. 4 strips, of which 3 display barely visible Beneventan writing saec. XI (?) (Patristica ?), reinforce the binding of a printed book (*Opus aureum ornatum...super evangeliiis totius anni secundum usum romanae curiae et ordinis fratrum praedicatorum*, n.p., 1542). Respective measurements (from top to bottom): 85 x 46 (70 x 36) mm., parts of 8 lines; 85 x 33 (75 x 33) mm., parts of 8-9 lines; 39 x 110 (width c. 106) mm., parts of 5 lines. (*F. Quarto*)
- 70 T 23. 4 strips in Beneventan saec. X (Glossarium graeco-latinum) reinforce the binding of a printed book (Melchior Cano, *Locorum theologicorum libri duodecim*, Cologne, 1585). Respective measurements (from top to bottom): 32 x 93 (22 x 45) mm., parts of 4 lines; 41 x 96 (26 x 47) mm., parts of 3 lines; 37 x 93 (width 45) mm., parts of 4 lines; 35 x 97 (width 50) mm., parts of 4 lines. (*F. Quarto*)
- S. N. (fragments removed from the bindings of various printed books and now kept separately). (*M. Virno, F. Magistrale, G. Cavallo, F. Newton*)
  - (i) Missale, with neums (Innoc.-Epiph.). Saec. XII<sup>2</sup>. Bari type. 1 folio, 210 x 135 (171 x 96) mm., 22 long lines. On the recto is the entry 'Evangelista romano (?) di Monte Sardo'. Removed from Stamp. 70 D 10 (Jacobus de Voragine, *Legende sanctorum*, Venice, 1516).
  - (ii) Homiliarium. Saec. XII. 5 small pieces, damaged and mounted on a page, the two largest measuring 85 x 40 mm., parts of 15 lines (Bernardus Clarevallensis, Homilia in laudibus virginis matris 2.3, 4). Removed from Stamp. 70 Z 154 (olim 59 H 8) (Francisco de Osuna, *Pars occidentalis in accomodas hisce temporibus evangeliorum quadragesimalium expositiones...*, Venice, 1572).
  - (iii) Commentarius in Iohannem 4:15 sqq. Saec. XII<sup>2</sup>. 3 pieces, 2 of which join to form a fragment measuring 88 x 108 (74 x 90) mm., 10 nearly complete lines; the third piece measures 86 x 46 (73 x 46) mm., parts of 10 lines. Removed from Stamp. 70 C 50 (olim 64 F 50) (Ludovicus



Maioranus, *Clypeus militantis ecclesiae seu De vero dei cultu libri tres*, Rome, 1575) with the ex-libris 'Questi libri sono comprati per Vincenzo Rizzo d'Altamura incola di Graulina per li Capuccini di Graulina'.

## BASEL

**Öffentliche Bibliothek der Universität: N I 6** (a miscellany of fragments).

**No. 5.** Homiliarium (Gregorius Antiochenus, Sermo de baptismo domini 3-4; Gregorius Magnus, Homiliae in evangelia 10.1-2). Saec. X/XI. 1 mutilated and damaged folio, trimmed on 3 sides so that parts of both columns are missing, 271 x 218 (height 249) mm., 2 cols., 30 lines surviving. Removed from ms. B V 23. (*A. Dold, M. Steinmann*)

**No. 65.** Breviarium (Oct. Nat.; Transl. s. Stephani diac. Constantinopolim [B.H.L. 7858]). Saec. XII. 4 scraps from the same folio, formerly serving as binding fragments in a printed book (E E VIII 2: Pietro Martire d'Anghiera, *Libro primo della historia de l'Indie occidentali*, Venice, 1534) acquired in 1640 by Remigius Faesch. 3 scraps are consecutive and constitute a section measuring (max.) 151 x (max.) 79 mm., parts of 25 long lines; the fourth scrap measures 45 x 72 mm., parts of 8 long lines. (*M. Steinmann*)

## BENEVENTO

**Archivio di Stato: Frammenti 26-29.** Homiliarium (Pent.; Dom. 1-2 p. Pent.). Saec. XI. 3 bifolia and 1 folio of varying sizes and methods of composition, all formerly serving as covers of documents (*not* Giovanni Battista Fasano of Solopaca); 2 cols., 32 lines. Cf. Mallet-Thibaut, pp. 261-64.

**Biblioteca Capitolare: 68.** Vetus Testamentum (Gen-Num). Saec. X/XI. Reported as missing in 1961 by Lowe, p. 215 and in 1976 by Brown, p. 278; now located. Cf. Mallet-Thibaut, pp. 313, 319.

**Commissione Diocesana per i Beni Culturali: S. N.** (fragments belonging to the Giordano family of Pratola Serra, formerly serving as covers of documents and now [November 1987] framed and hanging in the office of the Director of this Commissione in the Curia Arcivescovile). (*G. Giordano*)

(i) Missale, with neums (Canon missae). Saec. XIII. A mutilated bifolium, (max.) 298 x 285 mm., 2 cols. (width of 1 col. 90 mm.), c. 32 lines. Cf. A. Laudato-M. De Nicolais, eds., *Storiografia e fonti d'archivio. Campolattaro: 7-8 dicembre 1985* (Benevento, 1985), p. 17, no. 31 and outside front cover (color reproduction of part of one folio).

(ii) Augustinus, Tractatus in Iohannem 35.8-36.3. Saec. XII/XIII. A mutilated bifolium (the innermost of the quire), 309 x 286 (273 x 193)

mm., 2 cols., 25 of an estimated original 29 lines surviving. Cf. Laudato-De Nicolais, *ibid.*, p. 17, no. 31 and plate on p. 7 (partial reproduction of fol. 2v).

- (iii) *Vetus Testamentum* (1 Reg 12:9-13:8). Saec. XII<sup>2</sup>. 1 folio, mutilated and trimmed, 356 x 249 (305 x 205) mm., 2 cols., 32 lines. Cf. Laudato-De Nicolais, *ibid.*, p. 17, no. 31.

## BERGAMO

### **Biblioteca Civica 'Angelo Mai': Sezione manoscritti, Frammenti n.° 1.**

Breviarium, with neums (Feria 5 per annum). Saec. XI ex. 2 strips from the same folio, formerly serving to reinforce the binding of a single volume (shelf mark '3.189/3.193') comprised of various printed editions of the *Scriptores rei rusticae* with accompanying commentaries (Lyons, 1542, 1548, 1549); now removed and kept separately. 98 x 27 (height 53) mm., 2 lines surviving; 95 x 36 (height 50) mm., 4 and 3 lines surviving. A detailed study of these fragments will be published by dott. Francesco Lo Monaco in *Studi medievali*. (F. Lo Monaco, J. Mallet)

## BOLOGNA

**Archivio di Stato: Frammenti di codici** (various fragments removed from documents and now kept separately). (Our knowledge of these items is owing to dott.ssa Claudia Salterini who has supplied further information.)

### **Busta n.° 1.**

- (i) Augustinus, *De civitate dei* 8.26, 9.15-16. Saec. X<sup>2</sup>. A mutilated bifolium, perhaps the outermost of the quire and now displaying writing on two sides only, 438 x 350 (390 x 275) mm., 2 cols., 39 lines. Formerly serving as the cover of a register of 'extraordinary' expenses dated 1689. At the bottom of one folio there is the entry: 'Pezzo paleografico del secolo ottavo primissimo. 27 sett. <18>72. prof. Luciano Scarabelli.'
- (ii) Cassiodorus, *Expositio psalmorum* 73:19-22, 75:6-10. Saec. X/XI. A bifolium, probably the outermost of the quire, 357 x 290 (390 x 275) mm., 2 cols., 30 lines. Formerly serving as the cover of notarial records; cf. the entries on fol. 1r: '1583 Actorum liber. Tertius liber 1583 pro primis mei Angeli M. de Barberis not. et ser Orinthii de Stancararis not.' (= Angelo Michele Barbieri, notary active at Bologna 1540-95; Orinzio Stancari, notary active at Bologna 1561-99).

**Busta n.° 2.** *Matthaeus* 1:1-18 et homilia. Saec. XII. 1 folio, trimmed, 225 x 160 (211 x 115) mm., 25 long lines. On the recto is the entry 'Character saeculi XI Longobardicus. Dono dedit Roñus (?) Trombellius die 15. Ianuarii 1768.'

## BRUSSELS

**Bibliothèque Royale Albert I<sup>er</sup>: IV 508.** Homiliarium (Augustinus, Tractatus in Iohannem 49.10-12; *ibid.* 31.8; *ibid.* 48.5-6; Gregorius Magnus, Homiliae in evangelia 33.1-2; Leo Magnus, Tractatus 63.3-7; Jerome, Commentarius in Matthaeum IV [26:6-9, 11-18]). Saec. XII. Bari-type features. A bifolium, trimmed, 364 x 269 (305 x 205) mm., 2 cols., 32 lines; parts of 2 folios, 159 x 229 (157 x 194) mm. and 165 x 232 (159 x 200) mm., 2 cols., 18 and 20 lines surviving. Removed from the binding of a printed book (Nicolaus de Orbellis, *Logica...vna cum textu Petri hyspani*, Venice, 1500) acquired in 1968. (*P. O. Kristeller, F. Lo Monaco*)

## CAMBRIDGE (Massachusetts)

## Harvard University, Houghton Library

**MS Typ 700.** Novum Testamentum (1 Cor 7:29-8:12). Saec. XII. 1 folio, stained and torn, 292 x 221 (240 x 133) mm., 26 long lines. Bought from Bernard M. Rosenthal in 1964 by Philip Hofer and bequeathed by him (d. 1984) to Harvard University. (*R. G. Dennis*)

**fMS Typ 701.** Missale, with neums (Dom. 4 p. Pent.-ss. Marcellini et Petri). Saec. XI ex. Bari type. 1 folio, 355 x 250 (272 x 187) mm., 2 cols., 29 lines. Formerly owned by Philip Hofer (d. 1984) who bequeathed the leaf to Harvard University; listed in *The Beneventan Script*, p. 178 under 'Manuscripts in Private Collections....' Other parts of the same manuscript will be sold in 1988-89 (see p. 602 below under LONDON).

## CAMERINO

**Archivio Arcivescovile: Miscellanea liturgica** (a collection of fragments). Novum Testamentum (capitula; 1 Pet 1:1-3:9). Saec. XI ex. 2 damaged pieces which join to form part of a very large folio, c. 500 x 157 mm., 2 cols. (width of 1 col. 103 mm.), 42 lines. Apparently used as a cover of a document; the verso of both pieces displays the name 'Pier Domenico Angelucci da Casavecchia' and various dates (1505-1508). (*S. Corradini*)

## CAMPI SALENTINA

**Alfredo Calabrese Collection:** S. N. Passionarium. Saec. XII/XIII. 3 scraps, 2 of which join to form a single fragment measuring 125 x 132 mm., 15 lines surviving; the third scrap measures 111 x 63 mm., 12 lines surviving. Removed from the binding of a printed book (Suetonius, *De vita Caesarum*, Venice, 1496) in the ancestral library of the Calabrese family. (*A. Calabrese, R. Jurlaro, F. Newton*)

## CAPUA

**Biblioteca Arcivescovile**

**VI F 31** (a miscellany of texts). († *T. Leonetti*)

- (i) Breviarium, with neums (fragm.) (s. Stephani). Saec. XIII. Kept loose in the codex are 2 strips (one vertical, the other horizontal) from (probably) different folios of the same noted Breviarium: 202 x 36 (130 x 25) mm., 7 lines surviving; 57 x 143 (22 x 120) mm., 2 lines surviving.
- (ii) fols. 2r-5r. Officium s. Mariae de Nivis, with neums. Saec. XIII. 325 x 214 (257 x 172) mm., c. 7 long lines.
- (iii) fols. 45r-147r (old foliation). Antiphonale. Saec. XIII/XIV. 335 x 245 (240 x 150) mm., 15-23 long lines.

**VI F 34.** Johannes Andreae, Apparatus super Clementinis in Gothic writing saec. XIV. Kept loose in the manuscript is the lower part of 1 folio containing Vitae sanctorum (Agapiti [B.H.L. 126]; Magni [B.H.L. 5174]) in Beneventan saec. XI in.: 237 x 315 (173 x 260) mm., 2 cols., 17 lines surviving. (*F. Newton*)

## CAVTAT

**Biblioteca Baltazara Bogišića: Ink. 57**, pastedowns. Missale, with neums (Feria 4-6 p. Pent.). Saec. XIV. Bari type. 2 folios (probably consecutive) pasted to the front and back covers of a printed book (Ovidius, *Heroides*, Venice, 1485) with the ex-libris 'Franciscus de Aligretti Raguseo': 307 x 200 mm., 2 cols., 30 lines. (*M. Bete*)

## CHAPEL HILL (North Carolina)

**University of North Carolina, Wilson Library: 512.** Augustinus, Tractatus in Iohannem 1.9-10, 11-12. Saec. XII ex. 2 strips from the same folio pasted to the front and back covers of a printed book (344/1488/Inc.: Joannes Gerson, *De immitatione* [sic] *Christi et De contemptu mundi in vulgari sermone*, Venice, 1488): 200 x 145-153 (132-190 x c. 75) mm., 1 of 2 cols. surviving, parts of 14 and 18 lines. (*D. Ganz, F. Newton, P. A. Stadter*)

## DUBROVNIK

**Biblioteka Družbe Isusovaca**

**S. N.** Vitae sanctorum (Longini [B.H.L. 4965]; B. V. M. [B.H.L. 5335]). Saec. XIII. Parts of 2 folios bound sideways and used as front and back fly-leaves in a printed book (Juraj Dragišić, *De natura angelica*, Florence, 1499) with the ex-libris 'Ad Vincentij Nicolai usum amicorumque eius anno Domini M.D.LXXJ. Vale' on the front Beneventan fly-leaf: 204 x

270 (width c. 180) mm., 2 cols., 17-20 lines surviving. (*R. F. Gyug, Š. Jurić*)

S. N. Missale, with neums: see below under **ZAGREB**.

**Dominikanski samostan** (various fragments displayed in cases or kept in a folder). (*B. Pecarski, R. F. Gyug*)

**Frag. (i).** Missale (Missae in comm. B. V. M. et ad poscenda suffragia sanctorum). Saec. XV. 1 damaged folio, 244 x 180 (c. 175 x c. 120) mm., 15 long lines. Cf. Pecarski, pp. 250-51, no. 5.

S. N. Antiphonale (Epiph.). Saec. XII ex. 1 mutilated folio, formerly serving as a cover, 11 long lines.

S. N. Haymo in epistulam Pauli ad Hebraeos 12. Saec. XI. Bari type. 1 folio, trimmed, 2 cols., 43 lines.

## FOGGIA

**Archivio di Stato: S. N.** (fragments removed from notarial records in the Archivio di Stato, Lucera and now kept separately). (*P. di Cicco*)

(i) Vita s. Felicis presb. Nolani (B.H.L. 2874). Saec. XI. 1 mutilated folio, 340 x 256 mm., 2 cols., 30 lines.

(ii) Hymni (cum neumis) (Chevalier 590, 4536, 11228, 18607, 34646) et Lectiones. Saec. XIII. 2 folios joined to create an artificial, damaged bifolium formerly serving as the cover for *protocolli* 230-232 (testaments for 1588-1601; *not* Vitantonio Cesarani, active at Lucera from 1588 to 1615): 296 x c. 232 mm., 2 cols., 25 of an estimated original 26 lines surviving.

## FOLIGNO

**Archivio di Stato: Ex copertine notarili, b. n. 2** (a miscellany of fragments). Antiphonale (Dom. 5 Quadr.). Saec. XIII. 1 mutilated folio, 330 x 243 (295 x 191) mm., 2 cols., 10 lines. (*A. Ziino*)

**Biblioteca Comunale: C 168** (a miscellany of fragments), **fasc. 22.** (*F. Newton*)

(i) Vitae sanctorum (Marcellini, Petri et soc. [B.H.L. 5231]; Vincentii, Benigni et soc. [B.H.L. 8676]). Saec. XI in. Part of 1 damaged folio, 214 x 145 mm., 2 cols. (estimated width of 1 col. c. 97 mm.), 20-21 lines surviving.

(ii) Hymnarium (Chevalier 12610, 915, 1361, 2959, 2953). Saec. XI ex. A damaged and mutilated bifolium, 270 x 160 (159 x 87) mm., 16 long lines. Pasted across the fold is a label: 'Biblioteca Seminario Iacobilli di Foligno'.

(iii) Homiliarium (Ambrosius in Lucam VII [12:27, 31]; Beda in Lucam V [16:13] + IV [12:22-23]). Saec. XI med. 1 folio, torn and stained, 385 x 282 (298 x 201) mm., 2 cols., 30 lines.

## FROSINONE

**Archivio di Stato: Fondo pergamene** (fragments removed from notarial records and now kept separately). (Our knowledge of these items is owing to *dott.ssa Viviana Fontana*; they are described below according to their serial number in the inventory [= 'inv.'] which she is presently preparing. The shelf mark ['segnatura'], when available, precedes the inventory number).

- 45 (inv. 131).** Missale (Fer. 5 p. Cin.; Dom. 1 Quadr.). Saec. XIII. A mutilated bifolium (second from the center), 227 x 156 (207 x c. 110) mm., 18 long lines surviving.
- 91 (inv. 132).** Vita sanctorum. Saec. XI<sup>2</sup>. 2 damaged and only partly legible fragments from the same manuscript: (a) the tattered upper part of 1 folio, 291 x 152 mm., 2 cols., 22 lines surviving; (b) a tattered portion of a bifolium (*ut vid.*), 295 x 147 mm., 22 lines surviving. Provenance: Veroli, Archivio Notarile (*not.* Antonius Baptista Manuelli, 1506-11).
- 83 (inv. 133).** Homiliarium (?). Saec. XI. 2 tattered and barely legible fragments which join and constitute a bifolium, (max.) 285 x (max.) 150 mm., 2 cols., 29-31 lines surviving. Provenance: Veroli, Archivio Notarile (*not.* Antonius Baptista Manuelli, 1506-11); Castro dei Volsci, Archivio Notarile (*not.* Sebastianus Francisci, 1520-25).
- 4 (inv. 134).** Sacramentarium. Saec. XII<sup>2</sup>. Remains of a bifolium (numbered 'a') and 1 small piece (numbered 'b') which forms part of the outer edge of the bifolium; 225 x c. 157 (151 x c. 100) mm., 17 long lines. Provenance: Alatri, Archivio Notarile (*not.* Angelo Cola Molella, 1482-1504).
- 54 (inv. 135).** Homiliarium (Ps.-Origenes, Homilia 3 in Matthaum [5:43-6:4]; Beda in Marcum II [6:47-48]). Saec. XI. Part of 1 folio, 262 x 292 mm., 2 cols. (width of 1 col. c. 124 mm.), 25 lines surviving. Provenance: Pofi, Archivio Notarile.
- 86 (inv. 136).** Patristica (?). Saec. XI. 1 mutilated and badly damaged folio, 354 x 290 (307 x 207) mm., 2 cols., 33 lines.
- 55 (inv. 137).** Vitae sanctorum (Antonini [B.H.L. 573]; Cornelii [B.H.L. 1958]). Saec. XI med. 1 mutilated folio, 336 x 263 (278 x 182) mm., 2 cols., 27 lines surviving. Provenance: Pofi, Archivio Notarile (*not.* 'A. L.', 1520-37).
- 81 (inv. 138).** Patristica (?). Saec. XI med. Remains of 1 tattered and badly damaged folio (one side is practically illegible), 400 x 287 (300 x 201) mm., 2 cols., 33 lines. Provenance: Castro dei Volsci, Archivio Notarile (1498-1525).
- 27 (inv. 139).** Novum Testamentum (Mc 14:7-10, 14-18, 21-39). Saec. XI/XII. Remains of a mutilated and damaged bifolium (only a small piece

- of the first leaf survives), the innermost of the quire, 310 x 195 (220 x 128) mm., 21 long lines.
- inv. 140 + 103 (inv. 145).** Homiliarium (= Barré, pp. 27-29, 'homélieaire italien'). Saec. XII<sup>2</sup>. 2 mutilated and damaged bifolia, measuring respectively 235 x 170 (206 x 120) mm. and 220 x 161 (205 x 124) mm., 26 long lines. Provenance (103 [inv. 145]): Ceccano, Archivio Notarile (*not.* Torquato, 1511-46).
- inv. 141.** Novum Testamentum (Mt 26:9-28). Saec. XI/XII. 1 folio (rubbed), 276 x 177 (186 x 99) mm., 23 long lines.
- 40 (inv. 142).** Missale (Dom. 5-7 p. Pent.). Saec. XIII. A mutilated and damaged bifolium, 270 x 181 (194 x 109) mm., 17 long lines.
- 33 (inv. 143).** Evangelistarium (Lc 23:44-53; Jo 13:1-7). Saec. XI<sup>2</sup>. 1 damaged folio, 309 x c. 195 (219 x 130) mm., 21 long lines.
- 44 (inv. 144).** Evangelistarium (Jo 1:38-51; Mt 4:18-22; Jo 15:1-11). Saec. XIII. A mutilated bifolium (the innermost of the quire), 226 x 169 (width 115) mm., 20 long lines.
- 90 (inv. 146).** Homiliarium (?). Saec. XI. Part of 1 badly damaged folio, 152 x 220 mm., 2 cols., 16 lines surviving. Provenance: Veroli, Archivio Notarile (*not.* Joannes Martellus, 1545-51).
- 56 (inv. 147).** Vita s. Mauri disc. s. Ben. (B.H.L. 5773). Saec. XI<sup>2</sup>. 1 mutilated and damaged folio, 376 x 261 (321 x 201) mm., 2 cols., 34 lines. Provenance: Pofi, Archivio Notarile (1524-25).
- 92 (inv. 148).** Missale (Fer. 5, 6 ebd. 5 Quadr.). Saec. XI ex. 1 mutilated and damaged folio, 384 x 252 (278 x 167) mm., 2 cols., 27 lines. Provenance: Veroli, Archivio Notarile (*not.* Paschasius Thodinus, 1503-14).
- 85 (inv. 149).** Graduale cum sequentiis (Sabb. s.-Pascha). Saec. XII. Remains of a very badly damaged bifolium, 275 x 165 (202 x 108) mm., 12 long lines. Provenance: Castro dei Volsci, Archivio Notarile (*not.* Petrus Sebastiani, 1550-57).
- 65 (inv. 150).** Graduale (Dom. 2 Quadr.). Saec. XIII (*ut vid.*). Remains of 1 badly damaged folio, 284 x 208 (245 x c. 138) mm., 10 long lines surviving. Provenance: Castro dei Volsci, Archivio Notarile (*not.* Paolo Mangoni, 1514-20).
- 63 (inv. 151) + 63 (inv. 152).** Graduale (ss. IV Coronatorum; s. Andreae, Dom. 1 p. Pent.). Saec. XIII. Remains of 2 tattered and badly damaged leaves which join to form a bifolium, 243 x c. 258 mm., parts of 10 long lines surviving. Provenance (63 [inv. 151]): Castro dei Volsci, Archivio Notarile (*not.* Sebastianus Francisci, 1494-1500).
- 93 (inv. 153).** Missale, with neums (Commune virginis, *ut vid.*). Saec. XIII. A mutilated and damaged bifolium, 239 x 162 (c. 160 x 105) mm., 10 long lines. Provenance: Ripi, Archivio Notarile (*not.* Gratianus, 1532-39).

- 24 (inv. 154). Antiphonarium (Ant. maiores; s. Luciae). Saec. XII/XIII. 1 mutilated and badly damaged folio (illegible on one side), 288 x 222 (c. 276 x c. 150) mm., 11 long lines surviving.
- 60 (inv. 155). Missale, with neums (Dom. 2-3 p. Pasch.). Saec. XII. Upper part of 1 badly damaged folio, 235 x 239 (198 x 192) mm., 2 cols., 19 lines surviving. Provenance: Castro dei Volsci, Archivio Notarile (*not. Sebastianus Francisci*, 1525-28).
- 30 (inv. 156). Vitae sanctorum (Reparatae [B.H.L. 7184?]; ?). Saec. XI. Part of 1 folio (illegible on one side), 127 x 289 mm., 2 cols. (width of 1 col. 122 mm.), 12 lines surviving. Provenance: *not. Augustinus Paniscaldi*.
- 59 (inv. 157). Missale. Saec. XII. Remains of 1 tattered and badly damaged folio, 281 x 275 (239 x 170) mm., 2 cols., 27 lines surviving. Provenance: Castro dei Volsci, Archivio Notarile (1542-60).
- inv. 158 + inv. 159. Vitae sanctorum (Silvestri pp. [B.H.L. 7739 *ut vid.*, 1 strip]; Basili [B.H.L. 1024, 3 strips]). Saec. XI<sup>2</sup>. 1 vertical strip (155 x 40 mm., parts of 16 lines surviving) in inv. 158; 3 vertical strips in inv. 159 numbered 'a', 'b' (Vita s. Silvestri), 'c'. The largest strip is 'a': 391 x 44 mm., parts of 32 lines surviving. The vertical strip numbered 'd' (138 x 40 mm., parts of 7 lines surviving) in inv. 159 comes from a different manuscript: Homiliae (?), saec. XI/XII.

## GAETA

**Archivio del Capitolo Cattedrale: Corali.** Scraps in Beneventan pasted to the inside back covers of mss. G (a. 1570), K (a. 1569-77?), and M<sup>2</sup> (a. 1570) are mostly hidden by other folios pasted over them. Pasted to the inside back cover of ms. M is a bifolium in Beneventan saec. XII (?), 2 cols., 33 lines. (*R. Cosma*)

## Museo Diocesano

- S. N. Vetus Testamentum (Jer 51:31-58; Lam 3:10-4:-2). Saec. XI/XII. 2 folios, trimmed and serving as front fly-leaves for a Processionale secundum ritum vetustissimum almae ecclesiae Cajetanae (a. 1578), 330 x 235 (315 x 188) mm., 2 cols., 31 lines. Cf. R. Cosma in *Civiltà del manoscritto a Gaeta. Exulter e corali dal x al xvii secolo. Gaeta, Palazzo De Vio. Agosto-ottobre 1982* (Gaeta, 1982), pp. 78, 80-82 and plate (fol. 1v) on p. 79.
- S. N. Vita ss. Casti et Secundini (B.H.L. 1650). Saec. XII/XIII. 4 consecutive folios numbered '99-102', 494 x 330 (381 x 220) mm., 2 cols., 32 ll. Cf. Cosma, *ibid.*, pp. 83-84, 86-88 and plate ('fol. 101r') on p. 85.



## GENEVA

**Bibliothèque Publique et Universitaire**

**Comites latentes 195.** 'Kalendarium Tutinianum'. Saec. XIV. Acquired at the Sotheby sale of 19 June 1979 (lot 71). Cf. V. Brown, 'A New Beneventan Calendar from Naples: The Lost "Kalendarium Tutinianum" Rediscovered', *Mediaeval Studies* 46 (1984) 385-449 and pls. 1-12 (complete facsimile edition).

**Comites latentes 216.** 2 folios, formerly pasted to the inside covers, which have been removed and are kept together with the manuscript. The main text, in 15th-century writing, is a humanistic miscellany, containing, inter alia, Sallust (*Bellum Catilinae*, *Bellum Iugurthinum*) and various works by Leonardo Bruni. Acquired in 1986 from Arturo Pregliasco, Turin.

(i) Antiphonale (Dom. 4 Adv.-s. Thomae). Saec. XII/XIII. 140 x 200 (width 170) mm., 6 long lines surviving.

(ii) Novum Testamentum (Mt 26:36-46). Saec. XII<sup>2</sup>. 200 x 140 (140 x 80) mm., 16 long lines.

**Comites latentes 224.** Patristica (?). Saec. XI. A scrap, 42 x 83 mm., 2 cols., parts of 5 lines. Received as a gift in 1987.

## GIESSEN

**Universitätsbibliothek: NF 444.** Breviarium (Off. defunctorum). Saec. XI<sup>2</sup>. 1 damaged folio, formerly serving as the binding of a printed book (E. 29377: John Barclay, *Argenis*, Nuremberg [?], 1693 [?]): 295 x 193 (220 x 120) mm., 2 cols., 22 lines. Cf. B. Bader, 'Ein beneventanisches Handschriftenfragment in der Universitätsbibliothek Giessen' in *Forschungen aus der Handschriftenabteilung der Universitätsbibliothek Giessen* (Berichte und Arbeiten aus der Universitätsbibliothek Giessen 39; Giessen, 1985), pp. 1-14 and 2 plates (recto and verso). (*B. Bader*)

## GIOVINAZZO

**Archivio Capitolare**

S. N. Missale, with neums (Fer. 4-6 p. Pent.). Saec. XI. Bari type. 1 mutilated folio, 264 x 302 (width 206) mm., 2 cols., 26 lines surviving. (*F. Newton*)

S. N. Augustinus, Tractatus in Iohannem 28.7-11. Saec. XI. Bari type. 1 folio, 405 x 292 (331 x c. 227) mm., 2 cols., 35 lines. (*F. Newton*)

## GIRONA

**Arxiu de la Catedral:** S. N. Medica ('Receptarium'). Saec. X<sup>2</sup>. A bifolium discovered at Castellar de la Selva (near Girona) and formerly serving as a cover for a register of 1641 ('Capbreuats del mas Montaner y del mas

Ricart del Castellar y mas Farran vuy Matas Tauarner'), 370 x 282-287 (220 x 128-134) mm., 27 long lines. Cf. J. Alturo i Perucho, 'Manuscripts i documents en escriptura beneventana conservats a Catalunya', *Studi medievali*, 3rd Ser., 28 (1987) 360-66 and pls. 3, 4 (fols. 1v, 2r). (J. Alturo i Perucho)

## GORIZIA

**Biblioteca del Seminario Teologico Centrale: Sezione antica 4 a 9**, paste-downs. *Vetus Testamentum* (Num 32:22-32, 33-33:1, 35:22-33, 33-36:7). Saec. XII<sup>2</sup>. 2 folios, trimmed and pasted to the front and back covers of a printed book (*Clarissimi...magistri Thome de Vio Caietani...in primam...Thome Aquinatis Summe theologie partem commentaria*, Venice, 1508); 310 x 205 (290 x 195) mm., 2 cols., 30 and 29 of the original 31 lines surviving. The book came to its present location from the Dominican convents in Capodistria and Parenzo; cf. S. Cavazza, *Catalogo del Fondo Antico della Biblioteca del Seminario di Gorizia* (Florence, 1975), pp. xii, 117 no. 663. (C. Scaloni)

## GOSLAR

**Stadtarchiv: S. N. Canonistica** (epistula Clementis secunda cum additionibus [JK †11]). Saec. XI. A scrap, 50 x 82 mm., 1 of 2 cols. surviving, 7 lines. (H. Hoffmann, F. Newton)

**KARIN:** see below under **ZADAR**

## KOŠLJUN (Krk)

**Muzej franjevačkog samostana**

**Ink. 15/16** *Paulus Venetus*, *Expositio in Analytica posteriora Aristotelis* (Venice, 1477); *Thomas Aquinas*, *Expositio in Analytica posteriora Aristotelis* (Venice, 1481). *Offsets in Beneventan saec. XIII (?) containing Vitae sanctorum (?; Barbarae) are preserved on the inside front and back covers: 300 x 205 mm., 2 cols., 28 (?) lines.* (R. F. Gyug)

**Ink. 67**, front and back fly-leaves. *Vetus Testamentum* (Gen 23:16-24:36). Saec. XIII. 1 folio (*ut vid.*) cut into 3 pieces, the largest measuring 150 x 200 mm.; 2 cols., 29 of an estimated original 32 lines surviving. The main text contains St. Bonaventure, *Opuscula* (Venice, 1502). Cf. Pecarski, p. 252 ('Krk - Košljun', no. 1). (These fragments, together with those described immediately below, constitute the 5 doubtful items in Brown, p. 282; Dr. Richard F. Gyug confirmed the entries in Pecarski and supplied further information).

**Ink. 85.** *Missale* (Nat. Dni). Saec. XIII. Parts of 2 consecutive folios pasted to the inside front and back covers of a printed book (Pierre Bersuire,

*Repertorium morale*, Nuremberg, 1499): 310 x 120 mm., 29-30 of an estimated original 31 lines surviving. Cf. Pecarski, pp. 252-53 ('Krk', no. 2). (*R. F. Gyug, Š. Jurić*)

## LENINGRAD

**Arkhiv Leningradskogo Otdeleniia Instituta Istorii Akademii Nauk SSSR: 15/622 + 30/626.** Missale, with neums (Ascen. Dni). Saec. XII/XIII. 1 mutilated folio cut in two, 123 x 181 and 184 x 120 mm.; estimated original 320 x 190 (270 x 170) mm., 2 cols., 28 of the original 29 lines surviving. From the collection of Nikolai Likhachev. Cf. V. Kartsovnik, 'New Italian Neumatic Fragments in Leningrad' in *Musica antiqua. Acta scientifica* 7 (1988) (forthcoming). (*V. Kartsovnik*)

**Gosudarstvennaia Publichnaia Biblioteka im. M. E. Saltykova-Shchedrina: lat. O.v.I. 225.** Miscellanea patristica (Epistola s. Gelasii papae, etc.). Saec. XI/XII. 2 folios, trimmed, 240 x 155 (170 x 115) mm., 28 long lines. (*V. Kartsovnik*)

## LONDON

**Christopher de Hamel Collection:** S. N. Passionarium. Saec. XII<sup>1</sup>. A scrap (with writing visible on one side only), 78 x 68 mm., 11 lines surviving; formerly pasted to fol. 66v of an Antiphonarium in Gothic writing saec. XV/XVI belonging to Walter B. Beals. This Antiphonarium and the Beneventan scrap were sold separately at the Sotheby sale of 7 December 1982 (lots 99 and 6 respectively). The present owner received the Beneventan fragment as a gift from Alan G. Thomas, the purchaser. (*C. de Hamel*)

**Bernard Quaritch Ltd** (various fragments to be offered for sale in 1988-89; see also p. 625 below under San Francisco for previously reported items to be sold with the present fragments). (*R. A. Linenthal*)

- (i) Graduale cum tropis (?) (Purif. B. V. M.). Saec. XI. 1 vertical strip, 195 x 74 mm., parts of 12 lines.
- (ii) Hagiographica (?). Saec. XII. Bari type. A scrap, 47 x 37 mm., parts of 7 lines.
- (iii) Homiliarium (Ambrosius in Lucam 5.12-15; Leo Magnus, Tractatus 76.1, 2). Saec. XII. Remains of 1 folio, 100 x 170 mm., 2 cols., parts of 6 and 11 lines. Other fragments of the same manuscript are in Naples (p. 607 below).
- (iv) Liturgica, with neums (sequentiae). Saec. XI. 2 pieces, 73 x 161 mm., parts of 4 lines and 53 x 157 mm., parts of 2 lines.
- (v) Homiliarium (Gregorius Magnus, Homiliae in evangelia 32.6, 7-8; ibid. 37.1, 2). Saec. XII<sup>2</sup>. 2 horizontal strips from the upper part of 2

- consecutive folios, 51-54 x 232-287 mm., 2 cols. (width of 1 col. 98 mm.), 3 and 4 lines.
- (vi) Antiphonale (s. Agathae). Saec. XIII. 1 mutilated and damaged folio, 380 x 260 (290 x 160) mm., 13 long lines.
- (vii) Missale (Inv. s. Michaelis [8 May]-ss. Gordiani et Epimachi). Saec. XIV. 1 damaged folio, trimmed, 317 x 295 (277 x 160) mm., 2 cols., 19 lines surviving.
- (viii) Missale, with neums (Dom. 3 et 4 p. Pent.). Saec. XI ex. Bari type. 2 consecutive folios, c. 350 x c. 250 (c. 270 x 180) mm., 2 cols., 29 lines. The leaf immediately following is now in Cambridge (Mass.) (p. 593 above).
- (ix) Haymo in epistulam Pauli ad Romanos 9:1-10, 32-10:8. Saec. XII in. A bifolium, trimmed at the top and side so that part of the outer column is lost, 330 x 170 (height 297) mm., 2 cols., 38 and 39 of an estimated original 40 lines surviving.
- (x) Gregorius Magnus, Homiliae in evangelia 40.2, 3. Saec. XIII. 1 vertical strip, 215 x 70 mm., parts of 23 lines; formerly the inner column of the same folio on which the larger strip in Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale XV AA 1 constituted the outer column (for the latter cf. *The Beneventan Script*, p. 104 ['Commentarius in evangelium']). A third fragment from the same manuscript is also in Naples (p. 607 below).
- (xi) Missale, with neums (s. Bartholomaei-s. Augustini). Saec. XI/XII. 1 folio, stained, 264 x 182 (203 x 115) mm., 29 long lines. Formerly in the Otto F. Ege Collection and acquired at the Sotheby sale of 26 November 1985 (lot 41). For other parts of the same manuscript see the next item and also p. 623 below under London.
- (xii) Missale, with neums (s. Sabinae-Decoll. s. Iohannis Baptistae. Saec. XI/XII. 1 folio, stained, 267 x 184 (203 x 115) mm., 29 long lines. Acquired at the Sotheby sale of 14 July 1981 (lot 9) by Bernard M. Rosenthal and purchased from him in July 1987. For other parts of the same manuscript see the preceding item and also p. 623 below under London.
- (xiii) Graduale cum tropis (Ded. ecclesiae). Saec. XII. 1 damaged folio cut roughly in half, (originally) 310 x 216 (c. 240 x c. 155) mm., 11 long lines. Formerly in the Otto F. Ege Collection and acquired at the Sotheby sale of 26 November 1985 (lot 41; recto reproduced in the sale catalogue).
- (xiv) Psalterium (16:3-9, 18:2-14). Saec. XII in. A bifolium, trimmed, 209 x 146 (width c. 107) mm., 16 of the original 18 long lines surviving. Acquired from Bernard M. Rosenthal. Other parts of the same manuscript are in Palo Alto, San Francisco, and two collections in Tokyo (pp. 610, 615, 617 below).

## LOS ANGELES

**University of California, Research Library: 100 Box 178.** *Vetus Testamentum* (1 Mach 2:21-40, 2:46-3:5). Saec. XII<sup>2</sup>. 2 damaged pieces which join to form part of the same folio, 165 x 93 (estimated original width c. 104) mm., 31 lines surviving. Found loose inside the cover of an Aldine edition (Z233 A4 B96: Pieter Buys, *Authoritatum sacrae scripturae et sanctorum patrum quae in Summa doctrinae christianae doctoris Petri Canisii...citantur...pars prima*, Venice, 1571) which was acquired in 1983 from the Bottega Apulia, Bari and has a sixteenth-century ex-libris of the Capuchin friars of Marsico Nuovo. (*R. H. Rouse*)

## MACERATA

**Biblioteca Comunale 'Mozzi Borgetti': 1457** (a miscellany of fragments), fasc. XII. Antiphonale (Dom. 2 Quadr.). Saec. XI. Lower part of a mutilated and damaged folio (writing visible on one side only), 146 x 220 (width 141) mm., 6 long lines surviving. Formerly serving as a cover of a printed book: 22.14.A.3 (1-2) (olim 12.14.G.14), Andrea Palladio, *L'antichità di Roma breuemente raccolta* (Rome, 1575). Cf. *Inventari dei manoscritti delle biblioteche d'Italia*, vol. 103: A. Adversi, ed., *Macerata. Biblioteca Comunale 'Mozzi-Borgetti'...* (Florence, 1987), p. 37. (*A. Adversi, R. F. Gyug*)

## MADRID

**Biblioteca Nacional: 4585** (olim O 74), front fly-leaves. Poenitentiale, saec. XI ex.; Donatio Tertulli, saec. XII. 2 folios numbered 'IV' and 'V', trimmed and bound upside down in reverse textual order: c. 250 x 179 (176-179 x 150) mm., 2 cols., 23 lines. The main text, which contains *Opera s. Nili* in Greek saec. X, displays the Cassinese ex-libris on fol. 1r ('Est sac' mon' Casin' Sig. N.') and was originally joined with Vatican Library Ottob. gr. 250 (cf. *Quinto centenario della Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana 1475-1975. Catalogo della Mostra* [Vatican City, 1975], pp. 86-87, no. 225). (*F. Newton*)

## MATERA

**Archivio di Stato: Fondo Monasteri soppressi b. 1, fs. 1 anno 1576.** Missale, with neums (Dom. 3-4 p. Epiph.). Saec. XIII. 1 folio, 393 x 266 (309 x 182) mm., 2 cols., 34 lines. Formerly serving as the cover of a 'libro di amministrazione' for the year 1576 of the monastery of SS. Annunziata, Matera. (*A. Ziino*)

## MELK

**Stiftsbibliothek** (fragments from the same Antiphonale in Beneventan saec. XI ex. preserved in various codices; cf. J. F. Angerer, 'Unbekannte Fragmente beneventanischer Provenienz aus der Stiftsbibliothek Melk' in *Ut mens concordet voci. Festschrift Eugène Cardine zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. J. B. Göschl [St. Ottilien, 1980], pp. 377-403 and plates [complete facsimile edition]). (Further detailed information has been supplied by *Dr. Jonathan Black*).

- 1012**, pastedowns and fly-leaves. 2 bifolia pasted to the front and back covers so that in each case three sides only are visible, trimmed, 230 x 151 (170 x 115) mm., 11 long lines surviving. The main text contains various works of Bernardus Ayglerius, Ps.-Eusebius of Cremona, Ps.-Augustine, etc. in fifteenth-century writing.
- 1027**, pastedown. 1 folio pasted to the back cover, 215 x 153 (210 x 130) mm., 12 long lines surviving. The main text contains Bernardus Clarevallensis, *Sermones* in fifteenth-century writing.
- 1740**, pastedowns and fly-leaves. Part of 1 folio pasted to the front cover, 113 x 142 (width 105) mm., 7 long lines surviving; 1 folio bound sideways and pasted to the back cover, 207 x 142 (width 116) mm., 12 long lines surviving. The main text contains various works by St. Bonaventure and Bernardus Ayglerius, prayers, etc. in fifteenth-century writing.

## MILAN

**Biblioteca Ambrosiana**

- F 53 sup.**, fol. 85. Homiliarium (= Barré, pp. 27-29, 'homélaire italien'). Saec. XII. 1 folio, trimmed, 188 x 139 (158 x 100) mm., 25 long lines. The main text, in 15th-century humanistic writing, contains Ovid (Heroides), Juvenal (Sat. 2), and Italian and Latin poems and epitaphs. (*D. A. Yates*)
- T 98 sup.** Palimpsest, lower script of fols. 1-5, 7, 8, 32, 35 written at right angles to the upper text. Contents and date undetermined. 290 x 212 mm., 2 cols., 28 lines. The upper text contains Eberhard of Bethune, *Graecismus* in Gothic writing saec. XIV. Cf. G. Cantoni Alzati, 'La presunta biblioteca del Petrarca a Linterno: codici e falsificazioni' in *Vestigia. Studi in onore di Giuseppe Billanovich* 1, ed. R. Avesani et al. (Rome, 1984), p. 152. (*M. Ferrari*)
- D 137 suss.** (a miscellany of fragments). (*M. Ferrari*)
- (i) fol. 88. Commentarius in Lucam 8:40-56. Saec. XI. 1 strip, 50 x 260 (width 215) mm., 2 cols., 6-7 lines.
- (ii) fols. 89-91. Lectionarium (Ps.-Augustinus, Sermo App. 198.3-4; Maximus Taurinensis, Sermo 5.1-2; Passio ss. Petri et Pauli [B.H.L.

6659]). Saec. XII<sup>2</sup>. Upper part of 1 folio, cut into 2 pieces (fols. 89-90), 210 x 290 mm., 2 cols., 19 lines surviving; 1 mutilated leaf (fol. 91), 350 x 290 (270 x 190) mm., 2 cols., 27 lines surviving.

**S. P. 6/8** (a miscellany of fragments), **fasc. 17**. Vita ss. Donati, Felicis et soc. (B.H.L. 2297). Saec. X/XI. Upper part of 1 folio, 183 x 235 (160 x 205) mm., 2 cols., 17 lines surviving. (*M. Ferrari*)

**S. P. 6/14** (a miscellany of fragments), **no. 864**. Tiny scraps in wretched condition written in late Beneventan; not able to be photographed. (*M. Ferrari*)

**Biblioteca Nazionale Braidense: AG IX 10**, binding fragments. Graduale. Saec. XII/XIII. Strips, c. 10 x 138 mm., with traces of Beneventan writing reinforce the binding of 8 gatherings (fols. 11-105). The main text, in fifteenth-century writing, contains works of Leonardo Bruni and Lorenzo Valla. A detailed study of these fragments will be published by dott. Francesco Lo Monaco in *Studi medievali*. (*F. Lo Monaco*)

## MONTSERRAT

**Biblioteca del Monestir: 1347**. Haymo, Homilia in Marcum 16:1-7 (= Barré, p. 200, no. 30). Saec. XI<sup>1</sup>. Upper part of 1 very large folio, cut in two and formerly pasted to the inside covers of ms. 983; 210-216 x 144 mm., 2 cols., 17-18 lines surviving. Cf. J. Alturo i Perucho, 'Manuscripts i documents en escriptura beneventana conservats a Catalunya', *Studi medievali*, 3rd Ser., 28 (1987) 366-71 and pls. 5-6 (recto of both pieces). (*J. Alturo i Perucho*)

## MOUNT ATHOS

**Monē Koutlounousiou (Koutlounousiou Monastery): 53**, fols. 1-2, 202-203. Vetus Testamentum (Ez 44:30-45:18, 47:9-48:8). Saec. XI in. 2 folios folded to create 2 initial and 2 final fly-leaves, 336 x 229 (180 x 122) mm., 2 cols., 28 lines. The main text, saec. XI, contains Johannes Scholasticus, Climacus (in Greek). (*J. Leroy, F. Newton*)

## MUNICH

### Bayerische Staatsbibliothek

**Clm 23621**, front fly-leaves (numbered '1' and '2'). Antiphonale (Purif. B. V. M.). Saec. XII<sup>2</sup>. 2 folios, trimmed and artificially joined to create a bifolium, 300 x 205-209 (275 x 149) mm., 12 long lines surviving. On fol. '1' is the entry 'e Cod. ZZ. 621'. The main text contains Sermones in Gothic writing saec. XIV. (*H. Hauke, B. Bischoff, F. Newton*)

**Clm 29280/17**. Gregorius Magnus, Moralia in Iob 6.1.1-2, 8.10-9.11. Saec. XI in. A mutilated bifolium, formerly serving as a cover of a register and

now in poor condition with writing visible on two sides only, 364 x 250 (274 x 170) mm., 2 cols., 27 lines. (*H. Hauke, B. Bischoff, F. Newton*)

## NAPLES

**Archivio di Stato: fondo Museo S. N.** (fragments removed from unidentified documents mostly connected with the Reale Camera delle Sommarie and now kept separately). (*C. Belli, S. Palmieri*) (Further detailed information has been supplied by *dott.ssa Belli*).

- (i) *Vetus Testamentum* (Num 6:15-7:21, 10:18-11:14). Saec. XI. 2 folios, 316 x 262 (277 x 200) mm., 2 cols., 23 lines.
- (ii) *Vita s. Silvestri* pp. (B.H.L. 7726). Saec. XI<sup>2</sup>. Bari type. 1 mutilated folio, height 330 (282 x 190) mm., 2 cols., 31 lines. On the recto is a late entry: 'Petrelli (?) Santarelli (?) Erarij Bari'.
- (iii) *Hieronymus, Praefationes in evangelio et in Matthaeum*. Saec. XII<sup>2</sup>. Bari type. A bifolio, 326 x 213 (222 x c. 120) mm., 25 long lines.
- (iv) *Missale* (Transfig.). Saec. XII<sup>2</sup>. 1 folio, height 311 (245 x 170) mm., 2 cols., 23 lines.
- (v) *Vita s. Margaritae* (B.H.L. 5308). Saec. XIII. 1 folio, 420 x 305 (308 x 209) mm., 2 cols., 30 lines.
- (vi) *Breviarium*, with neums (Purif. B. V. M.). Saec. XIII. Upper part of 1 folio, height 183 (width 200) mm., 2 cols., 16 lines surviving. Another part of the same manuscript is Cremona, Biblioteca Statale Fragm. Cod. 1.2 (olim Fragm. Cod. 2) (*The Beneventan Script*, p. 36; now identified as Ps.-Augustinus, *Sermo* [Caillau I, 49]).
- (vii) *Graduale cum sequentiis* (Fer. 2-3 p. Pasch.). Saec. XIII. 1 mutilated folio, height 288 (width 148) mm., 12 long lines.

**Biblioteca della Società Napoletana di Storia Patria: XXXIII A 1 (1-4)** (a miscellany of fragments). (*S. Palmieri*)

- 1. *Vitae sanctorum* (Columbae [B.H.L. 1892?]; Basilii [B.H.L. 1022]). Saec. XI. Bari type. 1 folio, trimmed, 332 x 242 (315 x 224) mm., 2 cols., 36 lines. Cf. J.-M. Martin, 'Un nouveau manuscrit bénéventain', *Archivio storico per le provincie napoletane*, 3rd Ser., 17 (1978) 387-92.
- 2. *Caesarius Arelatensis, Sermones* 234, 160, 235, 236 (cum interpolatoinibus). Saec. XII<sup>2</sup>. A bifolium (trimmed) and 2 folios: (max.) 287 x (max.) 205 (222 x 119) mm., 25 long lines.
- 3. *Excerptum e cartulario* (?). Saec. XII<sup>2</sup>. 1 folio (with writing on one side only), 322 x 230 (height 212) mm., 1 of 2 cols. written, 25 lines.
- 4. *Constitutiones Petri Surrentini* ep. Neap. (exc.). Saec. XVI vel XVII (?) (imitation Beneventan?). A bifolium (the innermost of the quire), trimmed, 222 x 153 (210 x 137) mm., 29 long lines.



**Biblioteca Nazionale**

- I H 10**, front and back fly-leaves. Homiliarium (Gregorius Magnus, Homiliae in evangelia 34.18; ibid. 36.13; Haymo, Homilia in Matthaem 5:20-24 [= Barré, p. 204, no. 54]). Saec. XIII. 2 damaged folios, 411 x 274 (332 x 233) mm., 2 cols., 32 lines. For the main text, in fifteenth-century writing, cf. Cenci 1.135. (Further detailed information on all the Beneventan fragments mentioned briefly by Cenci was supplied by *dott. Stefano Palmieri*).
- V C 23**, front and back fly-leaves. Missale (Epiph.-Dom. 1 p. Epiph.). Saec. XI ex. Parts of 1 folio, 140 x 205 mm., 2 cols. (width of 1 col. c. 85 mm.), 13 of an original estimated 18 lines surviving. For the main text, in fifteenth-century writing, cf. Cenci 1.197.
- V E 9**, back fly-leaf. Homiliarium (Augustinus, Tractatus in Iohannem 28.12; ibid. 48.1-4). Saec. XI. 1 folio, formerly pasted to the cover, 284 x c. 225 (270 x c. 200) mm., 2 cols., 30 lines. For the main manuscript (provenance: Aquila, Convento di s. Bernardino), in fifteenth-century writing, cf. Cenci 1.206.
- V H 112**, front and back fly-leaves. Missale, with neums (Fer. 3, 5 ebd. 3 Quadr.). Saec. XII. 4 pieces, sewn together to form 2 folios, 266-282 x c. 212 (width c. 170) mm., 2 cols., 23-24 lines surviving. For the main manuscript (provenance: Aquila, Convento di s. Bernardino), in fifteenth-century writing, cf. Cenci 1.241.
- VI B 1**. Gregorius Magnus, Moralia in Iob, in ordinary minuscule saec. XII. 7 fragments of varying sizes from 2 Beneventan manuscripts have been removed from the binding and are now kept separately in an envelope. Cf. R. Pilone, 'Frammenti in scrittura beneventana conservati presso la Biblioteca Nazionale di Napoli', *Samnium* 57 (1984) 148-64 and pls. 1-8 (complete facsimile, much reduced). (R. Pilone, G. Cavallo)
- (i) Homiliarium (Ambrosius in Lucam 5.12-15; Leo Magnus, Tractatus 76.1-2). Saec. XII. 5 pieces, the largest of which measures 146 x 76 mm., 2 cols., 14 lines. Other scraps of the same codex are found in mss. VI B 12 (p. 624 below), VI E 41 (described below), XV AA 1 (*The Beneventan Script*, p. 104, 'Homiliarium') and in London (p. 601 above).
- (ii) Augustinus, De sermone Domini in monte 2.24.81, 25.82-83. Saec. XIII. 2 pieces, 76 x 94 mm. and 62 x 105 mm., 8 and 6 lines. Other parts of the same manuscript are in ms. XV AA 1 (*The Beneventan Script*, p. 104, 'Commentarius in evangelium') and London (p. 602 above).
- VI B 9**. Hieronymus, Commentarius in Isaiam, in ordinary minuscule saec. XII. Removed from the binding and now kept separately in an envelope are 15 scraps from at least 2 folios of a Beneventan manuscript saec. XII in., Bari type, containing Vita s. Petri ep. Alex. (B.H.L. 6693). The largest

piece measures *c.* 145 x *c.* 70 mm., 1 of 2 cols. surviving, parts of 13 lines. A scrap (B.H.L. 6692) from yet another leaf of the same Beneventan codex has been used to repair Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Staatsbibliothek Lat. fol. 936, fols. 1v-2v (*The Beneventan Script*, p. 24).

**VI C 3.** Hieronymus in Ezechielem. Saec. XII<sup>1</sup>. Bari type. (*F. Newton*)

**VI E 41**, fragments mounted on back fly-leaves (apparently removed from the binding when the codex was restored at Grottaferrata in 1973). The main manuscript contains various liturgical texts in ordinary minuscule saec. XII. (*T. F. Kelly*)

(i) Homiliarium (Gregorius Magnus, Homiliae in evangelia 29.10, 11; Augustinus, Tractatus in Iohannem 93.1). Saec. XII. 3 scraps, the largest measuring 85 x 92 mm., 2 cols., 3 lines. For other parts of the same codex see above under ms. VI B 1 (i).

(ii) Vetus Testamentum (Tob 1:8-*c.* 2:20). Saec. XII. A damaged strip, badly rubbed on one side, 307 x 121 (275 x 121) mm., 2 cols., 29 lines surviving.

**VIII AA 3.** Homiliarium monasticum de B. V. M. et Communi. Saec. XII in. (*R. Somerville*)

**VIII AA 30**, front and back fly-leaves. Inv. s. Crucis; Transl. s. Matthaei (B.H.L. 5693). Saec. XII. Parts of 2 folios, formerly pasted to the front and back covers, 205 x 140 mm., 2 cols. (width of 1 col. *c.* 105 mm.), 20-22 lines surviving. Another part of the same manuscript is in New Haven, Yale University, Beinecke Library 528 (*The Beneventan Script*, p. 107). For the main text of ms. VIII AA 30 (provenance: Sulmona, Convento di s. Nicola and Aquila, Convento di s. Bernardino), in fifteenth-century writing, cf. Cenci 2.763.

**XII F 17**, front and back fly-leaves. For the main manuscript, in fifteenth-century writing, cf. Cenci 2.897.

(i) (front fly-leaf) Breviarium, with neums (s. Nicolai). Saec. XIII/XIV. Part of 1 folio, 213 x 294 (190 x 261) mm., 2 cols., 11 lines surviving.

(ii) (back fly-leaf) Beda in Lucam 14:4-11. Saec. XI. Bari features. 1 folio, trimmed so that part of the top and outer column are missing, 285 x 217 (height 275) mm., 2 cols. (width of 1 col. 95 mm.), 33 of the original 35 lines surviving.

**Pasquale Capone Collection:** S. N. Codex confraternitatis s. Mariae Montis-fusculi. Saec. XII ex. Cf. G. Vitolo, *Istituzioni ecclesiastiche e vita religiosa dei laici nel Mezzogiorno medievale. Il codice della Confraternità di s. Maria di Montefusco (sec. XII)* (Rome, 1982), with study, edition and plates (pp. 82-83: fols. 13r, 46r).

## NEW HAVEN

**Yale University, Beinecke Library: 482, Box 4, no. 55.** *Lectionarium*. Saec. XIII. Upper part of 1 folio, damaged and trimmed, 159 x 213 (width c. 157) mm., 2 cols. (width of 1 col. 70 mm.), 14 lines surviving. Cf. B. A. Shailor, 'Another Fragment of Beneventan Script', *Manuscripta* 25 (1981) 49-50. (B. A. Shailor)

## NOVARA

**Biblioteca del Seminario S. Gaudenzio: 8,** front fly-leaf. *Graduale cum sequentiis* (Trinitatis). Saec. XI. Part of 1 folio, 130 x 94 mm., parts of 6 lines surviving. The main text contains a *Breviarium* in 15th-century writing (ex-libris on fol. 1r: 'Iste liber est mon.<sup>ti</sup> sancte Marie de gratiis'). (B. Baroffio)

## OPORTO

**Biblioteca Pública Municipal: Casa Forte - Gaveta de Fragmentos** (a miscellany of fragments). (M. C. Díaz y Díaz, C. F. Burnett)

- (i) Ps.-Oribasius, In libros 2-6 *Aphorismorum Hippocratis*. Saec. X. 5 damaged and trimmed bifolia (of which 4 are consecutive in part), the largest measuring 285 x 195 mm., 34-35 long lines. Cf. A. Cruz, *Santa Cruz de Coimbra na cultura portuguesa da Idade Média* 1 (Oporto, 1964), p. 219 and pl. 3.
- (ii) Ps.-Galenus, *Alphabetum ad Paternum*. Saec. X. 2 consecutive bifolia, the larger measuring 280 x 190 mm., 35 long lines. Cf. Cruz, *ibid.*, p. 219 and pl. 4 (fol. 4r).

## OXFORD

**Bodleian Library**

**Canon. Ital. 193.** *Latin and vernacular hymns and prayers in 15th-century writing (Dalmatian origin). Paper strips used to repair fols. 32r, 44v, 69v-70r preserve offsets of 13, 7 and 11 lines respectively in Beneventan (Liturgica, with neums, undetermined date). Cf. A. G. Watson in Manuscripts at Oxford: An Exhibition in Memory of Richard William Hunt (1908-1979)...*, ed. A. C. de la Mare-B. C. Barker-Benfield (Oxford, 1980), p. 139, no. xxx.4. (B. C. Barker-Benfield)

**Canon. Pat. Lat. 96,** fols. 32r, 33r, 34v, 37r, 38v, 39v. Palimpsest, lower script. *Liturgica*. Saec. XI (*ut vid.*). 386 x 272 (370 x c. 260) mm., 2 cols., 34 lines. Upper script contains a miscellany (Eusebius, Bede, Nicolaus de Lyra) in humanistic writing saec. XV (partly copied by Daniel Victurius). (B. C. Barker-Benfield)

## PALERMO

**Biblioteca Centrale della Regione Siciliana: I E 9.** *Ambrosius, De fuga saeculi in ordinary minuscule saec. XI ex.* (provenance: Collegio Massimo dei Gesuiti, Palermo). The rubricated titulus on fol. 1r is written in contemporary Beneventan. A study of this manuscript will be published by prof. Diego Ciccarelli in *Schede medievali* 14 (1988). (D. Ciccarelli)

**Diego Ciccarelli Collection: S. N.** Missale, with neums (Dom. p. Asc.-Vig. Pent.). Saec. XII. 1 folio, formerly used as a cover, 400 x 290 (320 x c. 220) mm., 2 cols., 29 lines. Presently (December 1987) on deposit in the Biblioteca Franciscana, Palermo (adjacent to the Basilica di s. Francesco d'Assisi). Cf. D. Ciccarelli, 'Un frammento di messale in scrittura beneventana', *Schede medievali* 5 (1983) 422-31 and 2 plates (recto and verso). (D. Ciccarelli)

## PALO ALTO (California)

**Stanford University, Green Library: M 389/5.** Psalterium (36:1-29). Saec. XII in. A mutilated bifolium (the innermost of the quire), 213 x c. 130 (width c. 107) mm., 18 long lines. Acquired in 1984 from Bernard Quaritch; cf. *Bookhands of the Middle Ages. Bernard Quaritch Ltd. Catalogue* 1036. 1984, lot 57 and plate (fol. 1v). For other parts of the same manuscript see p. 602 above under LONDON. (R. H. Rouse, G. H. Brown)

## PARIS

**Bibliothèque de l'École Normale Supérieure: 149.** *Graduale (fragm.) in Gothic writing saec. XIV: 1 folio (numbered '36' by a later hand), 543 x 403 (397 x 256) mm., 6 long lines. The last 2 lines of text on the verso (ss. Philippi et Iacobi introitus) are in contemporary Beneventan. Purchased from J. P. Rouillon in December 1984 by François Avril who presented it to this library shortly afterwards.* (P. Petitmengin)

**Bibliothèque Mazarine: Imprimé 12146.** *Vetus Testamentum (Gen 46:1-47:9). Saec. XI. Remains of a mutilated and damaged bifolium (the innermost of the quire), now serving as the cover of a printed book (Vincenzo Bandello, Tractatus de singulari puritate et praerogativa conceptionis salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi, Milan, 1512): 203 x (estimated) 180 mm., 2 cols. (width of 1 col. c. 75 mm.), 18 of an estimated original 25 lines surviving.* (P. Gasnault)

**Bibliothèque Nationale: gr. 1053.** *Various works of St. Nilus, Epictetus et al. in Greek saec. X/XI. On fol. 247v there are three lines in Beneventan.* (G. Cavallo)

## PERUGIA

**Biblioteca Comunale Augusta: 3299 (2).** Ps.-Augustinus, Sermo App. 155.2-4. Saec. XI<sup>2</sup>. Remains of 1 folio, formerly serving as the cover of a printed book (Misc. I C 4 (2): *Le catalogue des livres censurez par la faculté de theologie de Paris...*, Rome, 1549): 149 x 200 mm., 2 cols. (width of 1 col. c. 75 mm.), 15 lines surviving. Cf. M. Roncetti, 'Un'altra testimonianza di scrittura beneventana a Perugia', *Bollettino della Deputazione di storia patria per l'Umbria* 80 (1983) 281-85 and 2 plates (recto and verso). (M. Roncetti)

## PISTOIA

**Biblioteca Capitolare Fabroniana: 320**, fol. I. Augustinus, Tractatus in Iohannem 52.10-13. Saec. XI/XII. Bari type. Lower part of 1 folio, bound sideways and trimmed, 165 x 216 mm., 2 cols. (width of 1 col. 92 mm.), 14 lines surviving. The main text contains various philosophical works copied in 1522-23 ('scrittura cancelleresca'). Cf. S. Zamponi, 'Testimonianze di scrittura beneventana a Pistoia', *Studi medievali*, 3rd Ser., 21 (1980) 435-40 and 2 plates (verso; details of recto and verso). (S. Zamponi)

## PRAGUE

**Statní knihovna ČSR: X B 21.** Antiphonale (Dom. 4 Adv.). Saec. XII/XIII. 1 folio pasted to the front cover, 294 x 216 (width 205) mm., 10 long lines surviving. A folio in Beneventan pasted to the back cover has been erased on the side that is visible. The main text contains Gregorius Magnus, Moralia in Iob, in Gothic writing saec. XIV. (F. Newton)

## RAB

**Nadzupski Ured: S. N.** Evangelistarium, with neums. Saec. XIII. 27 fragments of c. 22 folios removed from 2 Graduals in Gothic writing saec. XV; (1 folio) 251 x 142 (166 x 91) mm., 13 long lines. Another part of the same manuscript is Zagreb, Nacionalna i Sveučilišna Biblioteka R 4106 (*The Beneventan Script*, p. 177). Cf. A. Badurina, 'Fragmenti iluminiranog evanđelistara iz kraja XI stoljeca u Rabu', *Peristil* 8-9 (1965-66) 5-11 and figs. 1-8, and I. Fisković, *Romaničko slikarstvo u Hrvatskoj* (Zagreb, 1987), pp. 24, 142 (no. 39) and color plate on p. 25.

## RAVENNA

**Casa Cavalli: S. N.** Patristica (*ut vid.*). Saec. XII in. 1 mutilated folio (written on one side only) serving as the initial fly-leaf, 204 x 127 (130 x 83) mm., 2 cols., 14 lines surviving. Only the blank side is visible of another leaf in Beneventan pasted to the back cover. The main text contains a humanistic

miscellany copied by Lorenzo Guidetti (1460s?). Cf. A. Field, 'An Inaugural Oration by Cristoforo Landino in Praise of Virgil (from Codex "2", Casa Cavalli, Ravenna)', *Rinascimento*, 2nd Ser., 21 (1981) 236 n. 2. (*D. Berardi, P. O. Kristeller*).

## RIMINI

**Giovanni Luisè Collection:** S. N. Sacramentarium (*ut vid.*). Saec. XI/XII. 4 small fragments of varying sizes, formerly serving to reinforce the binding of a printed book (*Boetius de consolatione philosophica et de disciplina scolarium*, Venice, 1498) and now kept separately: (maximum measurements) 58 x 170 (40 x 119) mm., 4 lines surviving. (*P. Delbianco, F. Newton*)

## ROME

**Archivio di Stato, Collezione delle pergamene** (fragments removed from various volumes and now kept separately). (*S. Cingolani, A. Petrucci, C. Cenci*)

**Cass. 266, no. 20.** Antiphonale (De prophetis, Novemb.; Nat. B. V. M.). Saec. XII ex. 2 mutilated folios, 292 x 229-233 (257-293 x 150-155) mm., 10 and 11 long lines surviving.

**Cass. 266, no. 21.** Antiphonale (Sabb. s.). Saec. XIII<sup>2</sup>. 1 folio, trimmed, 441 x 278 (371 x 227) mm., 8 long lines surviving. On the verso are the date '1564' (in pencil) and the names 'Vitelli', 'Spinola', and 'di m<sup>ro</sup> Martino Vetraro', identified by *dott. Paolo Cherubini* as Vitellozio Vitelli, Alvise Spinola, and 'magister Martinus Vitriarius', who were associated with the Reverenda Camera Apostolica in the 1560s as, respectively, camerlengo, *chierico*, and artisan (the accounts of 'magister Martinus' for 1561-65 are found, without a cover, in ASR, Camerale I, Giustificazioni di Tesoreria, b. 5, fasc. 20).

**Cass. 277, no. 9.** Vetus Testamentum (4 Reg 15:21-16:15). Saec. XII ex. 1 mutilated folio, 430 x 248 (height 376) mm., 2 cols. (width of 1 col. 99 mm.), 38 of the original 39 lines surviving. On the recto are the entries 'Banderaro', '1566', '8 feb.' and a name deciphered and identified by *dott. Paolo Cherubini* as 'Giovanni Attavanti etc.' (= 'banderari di Nostro Signore'), whose accounts for 1566 are found in ASR, Camerale I, Giustificazioni di Tesoreria, b. 6, fasc. 32.

**Cass. 277, no. 17.** Vita s. Pauli apostoli (B.H.L. 6570). Saec. XII<sup>2</sup>. 2 consecutive folios, 377 x 240 (285 x c. 180) mm., 2 cols., 28 lines.

**Cass. 278, no. 121.**

(i) Breviarium, with neums (ss. Petri et Pauli). Saec. XII ex. 1 damaged folio, 338 x 234 mm., 26 long lines. Later hands have entered on the verso '1556' and 'Del p. Ottavio'.

- (ii) Leo Magnus, Tractatus 82.3-7, 83. Saec. XI. A mutilated bifolium (the innermost of the quire), 323 x 222 mm., 2 cols., 31-32 lines.
- (iii) Homiliarium (Augustinus, Tractatus in Iohannem 49.27-28; *ibid.* 50.14 + 51.2; Hieronymus in Matthaeum IV [26:27-34]). Saec. XII/XIII. 2 mutilated folios, 280-285 x 234-228, 2 cols., 23 of an estimated original 26 lines surviving.

**Biblioteca Angelica: 1273.** *Bible in ordinary minuscule saec. XI/XII. On fol. 142v a slightly later hand has added a Beneventan rubric over an erasure.* (P. Supino Martini)

#### **Biblioteca Vallicelliana**

- C 45.** Palimpsest; Beneventan (written at right angles to the upper text in ordinary minuscule saec. XII) is clearly visible as the lower script of fols. 2, 4, 5, 11-20, 22, 25-27, 29-48, 50-55, 57, 58, 63, 64. Missale. Saec. X. 292 x 227 (227 x 185) mm., 2 cols. (width of 1 col. 85 mm.), 26 lines. The lower script of fols. 65-72, also palimpsest, comes from a different Beneventan manuscript saec. XI in., 201 x 137 (180 x 127) mm., c. 20 long lines surviving (liturgica, with neums). Fol. 73r (not palimpsest) contains the 'Treuga dei' in Beneventan saec. XII: 230 x c. 157 (229 x c. 147) mm., 37 long lines. Cf. R. E. Reynolds, 'Odilo and the *Treuga Dei* in Southern Italy: A Beneventan Manuscript Fragment', *Mediaeval Studies* 46 (1984) 450-62 and 1 plate (fol. 73r). (R. E. Reynolds)
- F 85.** *Martyrologium in ordinary minuscule ('romanesca') saec. XI (1024-43). An entry in Beneventan saec. XI fin. is found on fol. 2r. Cf. Supino Martini, p. 105 n. 15.*
- S. N.** (fragments removed from various manuscripts and now kept separately). (V. D'Urso, T. F. Kelly)
- (i) Lectionarium, with neums (Lam 3:41-61). Saec. XII ex. 2 folios, removed from ms. G 93 (according to a pencilled entry at the bottom of each leaf), 280 x 191 (202 x 127-147) mm., 10 and 20 long lines. Other parts of the same codex are in ms. R 32, fols. 21-26 (*The Beneventan Script*, p. 130).
  - (ii) Vetus Testamentum (Dt 24:7-25:11, 28:11-13, 18-25, 26-29). Saec. XIII. 2 folios cut into 4 pieces, (originally) 371 x 289 (280 x 163) mm., 2 cols., 29 lines.
  - (iii) Haymo, Homilia in Lucam 16:1-9 (= Barré, p. 204, no. 57). Saec. XII. Lower part of 1 folio, removed from ms. Q 60 (according to a pencilled entry at the bottom), 153 x 174 (41 x 122) mm., 4 lines surviving.
  - (iv) Homiliarium (Johannes Chrysostomus, Homilia 1 de proditiōe Iudae; Augustinus, Tractatus in Iohannem 55.1). Saec. XI. 2 mutilated consecutive folios, 310 x 210 (height 249) mm., 2 cols. (width of 1 col. 91 mm.), 31 lines surviving.

**Mario Del Nonno Collection:** S. N. *Rituale* (Ordines pro infirmis). Saec. XII<sup>1</sup>.

A damaged and torn bifolium, formerly used as a cover, 216 x 153 (175 x 106) mm., 17 long lines. Acquired in Rome, 7 October 1979.

**Josef Diener Collection:** see under ATHENS.

## SALA CONSILINA

**Archivio Parrocchiale di S. Pietro Apostolo:** S. N. (Our knowledge of these items is owing to *dott. Enrico Spinelli*, whose detailed study, with complete facsimile, will appear in a forthcoming volume of *Studi medievali*).

- (i) *Vitae sanctorum* (Felicis presb. Nolani [B.H.L. 2876]; Sebastiani [B.H.L. 7543]). Saec. XI. 1 damaged folio serving as the cover of a 'libro contabile' for the years 1577-1623, 295 x 278 (272 x 206) mm., 2 cols., 33 lines.
- (ii) *Jacobus de Voragine, Legenda aurea* LXXXVII (82)-LXXXIX (84). Saec. XIII<sup>2</sup>. 3 fragments from the same manuscript: lower part of 1 folio serving as the cover of a 'libro contabile' for the years 1678-80, 217 x 281 (135 x 230) mm., 2 cols., 15 lines surviving; mutilated upper part of 1 folio serving as the cover of a 'libro della ogliara della chiesa di s. Pietro' for the year 1682, 219 x 158 (191 x 140) mm., 2 cols., 21 lines surviving; 1 folio, trimmed, serving as the cover of a 'libro parrocchiale' for the year 1636, 356 x 231 (323 x 202) mm., 2 cols., 35 of the original 36 lines surviving.

## SALERNO

**Archivio di Stato: Frammenti 2-4** (fragments, all from the same manuscript, saec. XI/XII [*ut vid.*], which have been removed from various documents and are now kept together). (*G. Ruggiero, E. Granito*)

- 2. *Isidorus, Etymologiae* 8.6.3-23. A mutilated and damaged bifolium (only a tiny piece with an unidentified text remains of one leaf), 368 x c. 260 (282 x 212) mm., 2 cols., 40 lines.
- 3. *Ps.-Isidorus, Indiculus de haeresibus Iudaeorum* 16-29. 1 mutilated folio, 368 x 270 (283 x 210) mm., 2 cols., 40 lines. On the recto is the entry 'N. Nicolaus Jacobus de Leto 1534, 1535'; identified by *dott. Guido Ruggiero* as a notary active at Amalfi 1521-26 and 1534-36, some of whose records are preserved in ASS, Archivio Notarile Busta 183, vol. 2 (1534-35), which now lacks a cover.
- 4. *Isidorus, Etymologiae* 7.6.3-10; *Gregorius Magnus, Homiliae in evangelia* 34.12-13. Remains of (*ut vid.*) the outer column of 1 folio, 370 x 87 (281 x 61) mm., parts of 40 lines.



**Museo del Duomo: S. N.** (= Cappone 4). *Missale in Gothic writing saec. XV. Between fols. 116v and 117r there is an offset of a strip in Beneventan: '310 x 25 mm., 30 lines visible.* (T. F. Kelly)

## SAN FRANCISCO

### Bernard M. Rosenthal Collection

- S. N. Orosius, *Historiae adversum paganos* 4.6.26-35, 7.6-11. Saec. IX. 2 folios pasted to the inside covers of a manuscript in fifteenth-century writing (origin: Hollfeld, near Bamberg) containing Conradus de Brundelsheim, *Sermones de sanctis*: 305 x 190 (c. 250 x 160) mm., 2 cols., 28 lines. Another part of the same manuscript is in Bamberg, Staatsarchiv A 246, nr. 21 (*The Beneventan Script*, p. 14). (B. M. Rosenthal, *F. Newton*)
- S. N. Psalterium (15:4-16:3, 16:14-17:34, 17:38-fin., 18:15-20:3, 21:19-31, 24:9-25:1, 34:27-35:13, 36:30-37:5). Saec. XII in. 5 bifolia; measurements of 1 folio (Pss 16:14-17:11, 38-fin.) are 205 x 140 (190 x 103) mm., 16 of the original 18 long lines surviving. For other parts of the same manuscript see p. 602 above under LONDON. (B. M. Rosenthal)

## SAN GIOVANNI IN FIORE

**Archivio parrocchiale della Chiesa Matrice di San Giovanni in Fiore: S. N.** Gregorius Magnus, *Homiliae in evangelia* 34.7-9, 16-18. Saec. XI<sup>2</sup>. 2 mutilated and damaged folios (currently in process of restoration), 330-340 x 240-280 (295 x 205) mm., 2 cols., 29 lines. Formerly serving as the cover of a 'Liber baptizatorum' for the years 1633-34. Cf. P. De Leo, 'Testimonianze di scrittura beneventana a San Giovanni in Fiore', *Studi medievali*, 3rd Ser., 21 (1980) 447-51 and 2 plates (recto of both folios).

## ŠIBENIK

**Franjevački samostan: S. N.** Homiliarium (Hieronymus in Matthaëum II [14:25-27]; Caesarius Arelatensis, *Sermo* 199.5-6). Saec. XIII. 5 scraps from 2 folios reinforce the binding of a Graduale feriarum in sixteenth-century (?) writing: 70 x 75-85 mm., parts of 6-10 lines surviving. (R. F. Gyug)

## SPLIT

### Arheološki muzej

- S. N. Leo Magnus, *Tractatus* 51.6-8; Isidorus, *De officiis ecclesiasticis* 37.1-3. Saec. XI. Bari type. 1 damaged and torn folio, 415 x 288 (302 x 193) mm., 2 cols., 35 lines. On the verso is the entry 'Marci Maruli'. Formerly serving as a cover. Cf. V. Novak, 'Jedan prilog za izučavanje

- najstarijih rukopisa Leona i. Velikog i Izidora Spanjolskog', *Katolički List* 72.29-30 (Zagreb, 21 and 28 July 1921) 337-39, 350-53. (*R. F. Gyug*)
- S. N. Graduale (Dom. in Palmis-Fer. 4 maioris ebd.). Saec. XII. A bifolium (the innermost of the quire), trimmed, 292 x 205 (252 x 141) mm., 15 long lines. Formerly serving as a cover for a volume containing testaments (1398-1428) from Lastovo. Cf. A. Zaninović, 'Dva odlomka iz dvaju starinskih Graduala', *Sv. Cecilija* 22.2 (1928) 53-60 (with plate of fol. 1v on 55) and Pecarski, p. 253 ('Lastovo', no. 2).

## STOCKHOLM

- Nationalmuseum: B 1614-15.** Evangelistarium (Mt 26:8-15; Mc 14:7-12). Saec. XI/XII. 2 strips, 206 x 49 mm. and 160 x 52 mm., parts of 18 long lines surviving. Excised from Bitonto, Biblioteca Comunale A 45: B 1615 was removed from fol. 78, and B 1614 comes from another folio now missing altogether (for the Bitonto codex cf. *The Beneventan Script*, p. 25). Another fragment from a folio also missing in Bitonto A 45 is Geneva, Bibliothèque Publique et Universitaire Comites latentes 141 [see p. 625 below under Turin]. The Stockholm fragments were purchased from Hoepli in 1950. Cf. C. Nordenfalk, *Bokmålningar från medeltid och renässans i Nationalmusei samlingar* (Stockholm, 1979), p. 33 (description), color pl. 4 (recto of both fragments), and fig. 26 (verso of B 1614). (*C. Nordenfalk*)

## STRASBOURG

- Bibliothèque du Grand Séminaire: S. N.** (fragments removed from the binding of unidentified printed books). (*H. Hoffmann, F. Newton*)
- (i) Augustinus, Tractatus in Iohannem 49.6-12. Saec. XII. A mutilated and damaged bifolium (the innermost of the quire), 410 x (estimated) 300 mm., 2 cols., 34 lines.
  - (ii) Vetus Testamentum (2 Mach 8:11-9:6). Saec. XII/XIII. 1 mutilated and damaged folio, 317 x 250 mm., 2 cols., 32 lines surviving of an estimated original 35.

## SUBIACO

### Biblioteca del Protocenobio di Santa Scolastica

- LXII (64).** *Augustinus, Epistulae in ordinary minuscule (by several hands) saec. XII. The characteristic Beneventan punctuation for declarative and interrogative sentences is found passim on fols. 50r-51v, 54r-55v, 112r-114v (all written by the same scribe in 'romanesca'). On fols. 115r, 116v and 120v there are rubrics in Beneventan. Cf. Supino Martini, p. 180 n. 103.*

**CXV (118).** *Alcuinus, De trinitate; Augustinus, Enchiridion.* Written in ordinary minuscule ('romanesca') saec. XI ex. which displays Beneventan elements (often uncial d and assibilated ti, occasionally the characteristic forms of a and t, ligatures of ri and unassibilated ti, the Beneventan 3-sign for omitted m and suprascript 2-sign over the interrogative word). There are some instances of words written entirely in Beneventan (fols. 1v8 habere, 13v31 unitatis, 18r31 habere and poterit), and on fol. 52r lines 10-16 are in Beneventan. Cf. H. Schwarzmaier, 'Der Liber Vitae von Subiaco', Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken 48 (1968) 86 n. 14 and Supino Martini, p. 170 and n. 72. (H. Hoffmann, P. Supino Martini)

## TOKYO

**Keio University Library: 170X9/3.** Psalterium (21:5-18, 25:2-26:3). Saec. XII in. A bifolium, trimmed, 208 x 147 (width c. 107) mm., 17 of the original 18 long lines surviving. Acquired in 1984 from Bernard Quaritch. Another part of the same manuscript is in the collection described immediately below; see also p. 602 above under LONDON. (*M. Shibukawa*)

**Toshiyutzi Takamiya Collection: 30** (a miscellany of fragments). Psalterium (35:13-26, 37:5-17). Saec. XII in. A bifolium, trimmed, 211 x c. 143 (width c. 107) mm., 16 of the original 18 long lines surviving. Acquired in 1984 from Bernard Quaritch. Another part of the same manuscript is in the collection described immediately above; see also p. 602 above under LONDON. (*T. Takamiya*)

**TRASACCO:** see above under AVEZZANO.

## TROGIR

### Kaptolski Arhiv

**8, 9, 12, 15, 17, 18.** These manuscripts, in Gothic writing saec. XIV-XVI (Graduale, Antiphonale or Vesperale), have been variously repaired with scraps from several Beneventan codices. The scraps are grouped below according to their palaeographical and textual affinities. (Our knowledge of these fragments is owing to *Dr. Richard F. Gyug* who supplied photographs and further detailed information; in November 1987 mss. 8, 12, 15, 17, 18 were on display in the Crkva sv. Ivana Krstitelja [Church of St. John the Baptist] [Pinacoteca], and ms. 9 was on display in the Riznica Katedrale [Cathedral Treasury]).

(i) *Vetus Testamentum* (Gen 41:9-24, 26-38). Saec. XIII. 2 strips in ms. 8 (fols. 189r-v, 206r-v), the larger measuring c. 270 x 40 mm., parts of 23 lines.

- (ii) Antiphonale (Dom. 5 Quadr.; Dom. in Palmis; Ascen. Dni; Inv. s. Michaelis; s. Philippi diac.; ss. Viti, Modesti et Crescentiae). Saec. XIII. 7 scraps in MSS. 8 (fols. 54r, 77r, 91r, 209r-v), 9 (fol. 25r-v) and 12 (fols. 81r-v, 128v), the largest measuring 115 x 65 mm., parts of 5 lines. Another part of the same Antiphonale is in Vienna, Universität, Institut für österreichische Geschichtsforschung nr. 5, HS. B (Assumpt. B. V. M.) (*The Beneventan Script*, p. 173).
- (iii) Patristica. Saec. XIII (*ut vid.*). 1 strip in MS. 9 (fol. 22r-v), 145 x 90 mm., parts of 12 lines.
- (iv) Patristica (?). Saec. XIII (?). 1 scrap in MS. 15 (fol. 16v), 40 x 40 mm., parts of 5 lines.
- (v) Homiliarium (?). Saec. XIII. 1 strip in MS. 9 (fol. 176r-v), 170 x 44 mm., parts of 19 lines.
- (vi) Augustinus, Tractatus in Iohannem 29.8, 30.2. Saec. XIII. A scrap removed from MS. 17 and now kept in an envelope: 57 x 80 mm., parts of 4 lines.
- (vii) Hieronymus in Matthaeum III (18:15-21). Saec. XIII. 3 strips from the same leaf in MS. 12 (fols. 93r-v, 103r-v), the largest measuring 250 x c. 160 mm., parts of 24 lines.
- (viii) Vitae sanctorum (Viti, Modesti et Crescentiae [B.H.L. 8711?]; Nicandri, Marciani et soc. [B.H.L. 6073?]; Apollinaris ep. Rav. [B.H.L. 623]). Saec. XIII. Bari type. A scrap and offset in MS. 8 (fols. 37r, 227r respectively), a scrap in MS. 15 (fol. 1r-v), and a strip (370 x 30 mm., parts of 32 lines) removed from MS. 17 and now kept in an envelope: the offset is the reversed impression of Vienna, Universität, Institut für österreichische Geschichtsforschung nr. 5, HS. G, lower portion (*The Beneventan Script*, pp. 172-73). Another scrap of the same codex may be in MS. 9 (fol. 120r-v).
- (ix) Vita s. Donati ep. in Epiro (B.H.L. 2304?). Saec. XIII. Scraps in MSS. 8 (fol. 190r-v), 9 (fols. 1v, 25r-v), 15 (fol. 67r-v), the largest measuring 115 x 80 mm., 2 cols., parts of 12 lines. A strip (90 x 35 mm., parts of 7 lines) in MS. 9 (fol. 10r) may be part of the same codex.
- (x) Vitae sanctorum (Alexandri pp. et soc. [B.H.L. 266]; Eustasii, Theopistae et fil. [B.H.L. 2761]; Marcellini, Petri et soc. [B.H.L. 5230 *vel* 5231]). Saec. XII. Bari type. Scraps in MSS. 9 (fol. 30r), 15 (fol. 31r-v) and 18 (fol. 1r), the largest measuring 95 x 45 mm., parts of 21 lines. Other scraps of the same codex may be in MSS. 12 (fol. 81r-v), 15 (fol. 19r-v), 18 (fol. 46r).
- (xi) *Offsets are visible in MSS. 12 (fols. 83v, 84r), 15 (fols. 4r, 5r, 6r, 7r, 17r, 18r, 28r, 29r, 57v, 61r, 62r, 71v, 72r, 76r, 110r, 111r), 18 (fols. 35r, 40r); some of these are Beneventan.*

294. Beda in Lucam II (4:16-19). Saec. XI. Bari type. 1 badly damaged and mutilated folio, formerly serving as a cover, 366 x 284 (280 x 183) mm., 2 cols., 28 lines. Cf. Pecarski, pp. 254-55.
296. Homiliarium (Fulgentius Ruspensis, Sermo 3.6; Augustinus, Sermo 316.1-3). Saec. XIII. Bari type. A bifolium (the innermost of the quire), 236 x 150 (175 x 100) mm., 22 long lines. Cf. Pecarski, p. 255.

## UDINE

**Archivio di Stato: Fondo frammenti di codici, n. 184.** Breviarium (s. Andree). Saec. XIII. Upper part of a bifolium (badly rubbed on side), 105 x 185 (90 x 135) mm., 2 cols., 16 lines surviving. Cf. C. Scaloni, *Libri scuole e cultura nel Friuli medioevale. "Membra disiecta" dell'Archivio di Stato di Udine* (Padua, 1987), pp. 236-37 and pl. 65.2 (fol. 1v). (C. Scaloni)

## VATICAN CITY

**Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana**

**Vat. lat. 10511.** 'Bovino Bible' in ordinary minuscule saec. XI ex. Contemporary entries in Beneventan occur on fols. 112v, 325v, 343r, 350r. Cf. Supino Martini, pp. 26-27 n. 9. (P. Supino Martini)

**Chigi C VI 177.** Breviarium in ordinary minuscule ('romanesca') saec. XI ex. On fols. 44v, 45r, 46r, 47r, 89v there are marginal entries in Beneventan saec. XII in. Cf. Supino Martini, p. 171 and n. 73.

## VENICE

**Archivio di Stato: Atti diversi manoscritti, b. 159, n. 28.** Antiphonale (Ascen. Dni-Inv. s. Crucis; Inv. s. Michaelis; ?- s. Eustasii). Saec. XI/XII. 11 damaged folios, removed from unidentified volumes, 12 long lines. Cf. *Archivio di Stato di Venezia. Vivaldi e l'ambiente musicale veneziano. Catalogo di esposizione (24 giu.-30 sett. 1978)* (Venice, 1978), p. 14 n. 2. (M. F. Tiepolo, C. Salmini)

**Biblioteca dei P. P. Redentoristi di Santa Maria della Fava: 14,** fols. 112, 117. Homiliarium (Augustinus, Tractatus in Iohannem 30.7-8; ibid. 24.1-3). Saec. XI. Bari type. 1 mutilated folio, folded in two and bound sideways, 350 x 251 mm., 2 cols., 32 lines surviving. A fragment of a leaf (Augustinus, Tractatus in Iohannem 24.7 ff.) from the same codex is pasted to the inside back cover; mainly illegible because of offsets from the preceding folio as well as rewriting. Offsets of another leaf from the same codex are preserved on the inside front cover. The main manuscript contains Sermones (in Italian), saec. XIV<sup>1</sup>. (L.-J. Bataillon)

**Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana: Marc. lat. XIV 232 (4257)** (a miscellany of fragments). (F. Newton)

- No. 41.** Ambrosius Autpertus in Apocalypsin II (3:3-4, 9-10). Saec. XI. A bifolium, trimmed, 308 x 211 (285 x 187) mm., 2 cols., 32 lines surviving. Pasted to the upper part of the recto of the second leaf is a rectangular paper fragment (written on one side only), 36 x 169 mm., 6 lines with traces of a 7th, which contains Mt 2:1-3, 8 in imitation Beneventan.
- No. 43.** Vetus Testamentum (Num 26:63-27:3, 5-13, 17-23, 28:4-10). Saec. XII<sup>1</sup>. 1 mutilated folio, trimmed and folded in half (now bound in reverse textual order), 220 x 257 (185 x 161) mm., 2 cols., 21 lines surviving.
- No. 44.** Missale (Fer. 3-6 p. Pent.). Saec. XIII. A mutilated bifolium (the innermost of the quire), 369 x 230 (280 x 163) mm., 2 cols., 32 lines surviving.

## VENOSA

- Biblioteca Comunale: 1.** Commentarius in evangelium Matthaei. Saec. XI ex. Cf. V. Brown, 'A New Commentary on Matthew in Beneventan Script at Venosa', *Mediaeval Studies* 49 (1987) 443-65 and 6 plates (fols. 1r, 7v, 37v, 38r, 115v, 116r). (*A. Santangelo*)

## VIENNA

- Österreichische Nationalbibliothek: Ser. n. 4425.** Evangelistarium (Lc 21:25-33; Mt 11:2-10). Saec. XIII. 1 folio, trimmed, 255 x 158 (216 x 110) mm., 23 long lines. Cf. O. Mazal, *Katalog der abendländischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek 'Series Nova' (Neuerwerbungen)* 4 (Vienna, 1975), p. 192. (*B. Bischoff, F. Newton*)
- Universität, Institut für österreichische Geschichtsforschung: nr. 5** (a collection of fragments), S. N. Augustinus, Tractatus in Iohannem 53.2-3, 59.1-2. Saec. XIII. Lower part of a bifolium (probably the outermost of the quire), 137 x 182 (90 x 122) mm., 9-10 long lines surviving of an estimated original c. 21. (*F. Newton*)

## ZADAR

- Historijski Arhiv: S. N. (formerly KARIN, Franjevački samostan Ink. 2,** cover). Antiphonale (Inv. s. Crucis; Decoll. s. Iohannis Baptistae). Saec. XIII. 2 damaged folios, 410 x 327 mm., 12 long lines. Removed from Ink. 2 (Jacobus de Voragine, *Legenda aurea*, Venice, 1488) and transferred in April 1988 from Karin to its present location. (*Š. Jurić, S. Bačić*).
- Ordinarijat Zadar: 10 (17/l), 28 (9/a), 33 (13/a), 36 (15/a), 38 (15/b).** Antiphonale (s. Gregorii; Annunt.; Septuag.-Fer. 5 in Cena Dni). Saec. XI ex. Bari type. 5 bifolia, restored, formerly nailed to the back of the choir stalls in the Katedrala sv. Anastazije and painted on one side in

green with black petal patterns: (maximum measurements) 188 x 185 (width 111) mm., 9 long lines. Cf. J. Andreis, *Music in Croatia*, 2nd enl. edition (Zagreb, 1982), p. 10. (R. E. Reynolds, R. F. Gyug)

## ZAGREB

### Arhiv Hrvatske

**Documenta medievalia varia: 2.** Possessiones monasterii s. Benedicti Spalati. Saec. XII. 330 x 285 mm., 33 long lines. Cf. I. Ostojić, *Benediktinci u Hrvatskoj* 2 (Split, 1964), p. 358 and pl. 413 (much reduced). (R. F. Gyug)

### Zbirka rukopisi

**MSC 57/9.** Apparitio s. Michaelis archangeli in Chonis. Saec. XIII. A damaged and mutilated bifolium, 315 x 215 (width 183) mm., 2 cols., 31 lines surviving. Acquired in 1948 (gift of Miroslav Vanino, S.J.: 'Acq. 37'). (R. F. Gyug)

**MSC 57/10-11.** Novum Testamentum (2 Cor 8:19-11:19; Gal 1:1-3:5). Saec. XI/XII. Bari type. 2 mutilated and damaged bifolia, 225 x (max.) 194 (width 146) mm., 2 cols., 26-27 of an estimated original 32 lines surviving. Acquired in 1948 (gift of Miroslav Vanino, S.J.: 'Acq. 37'). (R. F. Gyug)

**Metropolitanska knjižnica** (on deposit in the Nacionalna i Sveučilišna Biblioteka): **MR 1059.** *Offsets in Beneventan saec. XI containing Exaltatio s. Crucis (B.H.L. 4178) are preserved on the inside front and back covers of a printed book (Vita et transitus s. Hieronymi, Venice, 1485): lower part of the same folio, 2 cols., 17 lines.* (Š. Jurić)

**Znanstvena knjižnica 'Juraj Habdelić': 2027** (formerly **DUBROVNIK, Biblioteka Družbe Isusovaca: S. N.**). Missale, with neums (Fer. 4-5 ebd. 4 Quadr.). Saec. XIII. 1 folio cut in half and trimmed on one side, (estimated original height) 425 x 301 mm., 2 cols., 25 of the original 26 lines surviving. Now kept together with the printed book (*Opuscula diui Bernardi abbatis clareuallensis*, Venice, 1495; ex-libris 'Bibliothecae Res. Rag. S. I.') in which the fragments once served as pastedowns. Cf. M. Demović, *Musik und Musiker in der Republik Dubrovnik vom Anfang des 11. Jahrhunderts bis zur Mitte des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Zagreb, 1981), p. 366, no. 2. (M. Bete, Š. Jurić, R. Karaman)

**PRIVATE COLLECTION: S. N.** Antiphonale (ss. Gervasii et Protasii-ss. Iohannis et Pauli). Saec. XI. 4 consecutive folios, trimmed, 250-275 x 180 (width 145) mm., 13-15 of the original 16 long lines surviving. Cf. T. F. Kelly, 'Une nouvelle source pour l'office vieux-bénéventain', *Études grégoriennes* 22 (1988) (study and 3 plates, forthcoming). (T. F. Kelly)

## APPENDIX

*Addenda and corrigenda to The Beneventan Script*

AACHEN, Peter Ludwig Collection IX 1 and XII 2: now Malibu (California), J. Paul Getty Museum Ludwig IX 1 and XI 4 respectively.

BELGRADE, University, Palaeographical Seminar Lat. 1: missing and presumed lost during World War II. (*R. Nikolić*)

BENEVENTO, Archivio di Stato: S. N. The fragments containing Daniel, Vitae sanctorum, and Gregorius Magnus are now numbered consecutively as 'Frammenti 1-25'; for the new shelf marks and detailed descriptions cf. Mallet-Thibaut, pp. 254-61. Another part of the same hagiographical codex (Frammenti 9-14, 16-25) is Frammento 30: Vita s. Stephani (B.H.L. 7845) et Inventio corporum ss. Stephani protomart., Nicodemi, Gamalielis, Abibon (B.H.L. 7856 b), saec. XII ex. 1 folio, 347 x 255 mm., 2 cols., 27 lines; formerly framed and hanging in the office of the Director of the Archivio di Stato.

—, Biblioteca Capitolare

V 25, fol. 229. Graduale (Dom. 1 p. Oct. Pent.). Saec. XI. 292 x 185 (265 x 125) mm., 14 long lines. (*T. F. Kelly*)

S. N. MSS. 8, 18, 22, 23, 25, 26, 29 (= London, British Library Egerton 3511), 34, 35, 38, 39, 68 preserve(d) over a hundred hitherto unreported scraps from a number of Beneventan codices now apparently lost. The scraps were used to strengthen the binding or to mend individual leaves; most of them have been removed and are now kept separately. All the scraps will be fully described by *Dom Jean Mallet, O.S.B.* and *Dom André Thibaut, O.S.B.* in vol. 2 of the Benevento catalogue. They have generously communicated detailed information on the palaeographical and textual affinities of these items, and the following is a brief summary of their classification: MS. A = Psalterium, saec. XII (45 scraps); MS. B = Graduale-Troparium, saec. XI<sup>1</sup> (4 scraps); MS. C = Graduale-Troparium, saec. XI med. (16 scraps); MS. D = Graduale-Troparium, saec. XI med. (11 scraps); MS. E = Graduale-Troparium, saec. XI/XII (10 scraps); MS. F = Missale plenum, with neums, saec. X/XI (2 scraps); MS. G = Missale plenum, saec. XIII (6 scraps and 1 offset); MS. H = Antiphonale, saec. XII (1 scrap); MS. I = Libellus in agendis mortuorum, with neums, saec. XIV (1 scrap); MS. J = Missale plenum (Breviarium?), with neums, saec. XII (4 scraps); MS. K = Liturgica, with neums, saec. XII (3 scraps). (*J. Mallet, A. Thibaut*)

BUDAPEST, Országos Széchényi Könyvtár Cod. lat. 329: headings or parts of the text are in Beneventan on fols. 86r, 94r, 101v, 102r; Beneventan decoration is used throughout the codex. (*F. Newton*)

CAVA, Archivio della Badia della Santissima Trinità

6, fols. 87r-178v. Palimpsest; faint traces of Beneventan writing from at least 2 different codices are seen on fols. 97r-v, 104v, 106v, 107r-v, 108r, 109r, 135r, 136v, 145r,



- 170v, 177v-178r. (i) Unidentified text, saec. XI in. (?), written at right angles to the upper script; 328 x 248 (c. 276 x c. 197) mm., 2 cols., c. 26 lines. (ii) Antiphonarium, saec. XI (?); 258 x 167 (200 x 122) mm., 16 long lines surviving. (*F. Newton*)
- 10, fol. 181. Homiliarium. Saec. XII. 350 x 240 (327 x 190) mm., 2 cols., 35 lines surviving.
- CREMONA, Biblioteca Statale Fragmenta Codicum 1, 2: now Fragmenta Codicum 1.1, 1.2 respectively.
- DUBROVNIK, Franjevački Samostan 'Mala Braća' Incunabulum 98: the two Beneventan pastedowns have been removed and, after restoration, are now kept separately. (*Š. Jurić*)
- DURHAM (North Carolina), Duke University, Perkins Library Ullman 14: now Rome, Edward Ullman Collection S. N. (*T. F. Kelly*)
- EL ESCORIAL, Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo R III 1: the shelf mark is actually *R* III 1. (*F. Newton*)
- FARFA, Biblioteca dell'Abbazia AB. F. Musica XI and AB. F. Musica XII: now AF 338 Musica XI and AF 338 Musica XII respectively. (*T. F. Kelly*)
- GIOVINAZZO, Archivio Capitolare *X*<sub>i</sub> and *X*<sub>ii</sub>: now S. N. The holdings of the Archivio are being recatalogued (September 1987), and new shelf marks will be assigned.
- LEIPZIG, Universitätsbibliothek 3503 (Hänel 6): now Hänel 6 (olim 3503).
- LONDON, Maggs Brothers, Ltd, Missale, with neums (s. Leonis pp.-ss. Petri et Pauli): now Charlottesville, Marvin L. Colker Collection S. N. Saec. XI/XII (corrected date). Acquired from Maggs in 1980 (*Western Text Hands from Late 9th to Early 14th Century. Catalogue 1002. Maggs Bros. Ltd. London* [1980], lot 40 and pl. 17 [recto]). Other parts of the same manuscript are listed in *The Beneventan Script*, p. 39 under Durham, Duke University, Perkins Library Ullman 14; see also in this article above and p. 625 below respectively for the new locations of the Durham and San Francisco fragments. To these membra disiecta should be added Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit B. P. L. 2842 (*The Beneventan Script*, p. 51).
- LUCCA, Biblioteca Capitolare Feliniana: 593. Fol. 269v is also in Beneventan saec. XI<sup>2</sup> which has been partly erased and written over with Italian minuscule.
- MOLFETTA, Graziano Bellifemine Collection: S. N. Presented by Mons. Bellifemine to the Archivio Unico Diocesano, Monopoli (current shelf mark undetermined).
- MONOPOLI, Archivio Unico Diocesano: MS. B 27, binding strips. A 4th strip from the same manuscript (Vitae sanctorum) has been detached and is kept in a folder with other fragments. Present measurements of the new strip (Sergii et Bacchi [B.H.L. 7599]; Hilarionis [B.H.L. 3879]): 60 x 205 mm., 2 cols., 6 lines surviving. Possibly the item described by Brown, p. 283 under Molfetta, Graziano Bellifemine Collection (ii). (*F. Newton*)
- MONTE CASSINO, Archivio della Badia (unreported fragments in Beneventan manuscripts described by M. Inguanez, *Codicum casinensium manuscriptorum catalogus*, 3 vols. [Monte Cassino, 1915-41]). (*F. Newton*)
- 21, pp. 461-462. Missale (Sabb. 4 Temp. Quadr.). Saec. XI ex. 357 x 238 (265 x 164) mm., 2 cols., 26 lines.

71, fly-leaves.

(i) pp. 1-2, 299-300. Homiliarium (Augustinus, Sermo 336.4-6; Ps.-Augustinus, Sermo [Caillau I, 46]; Ps.-Augustinus, Sermo [Fraia 10.1-3]). Saec. XI<sup>1</sup>. 378 x 250 (292 x 193) mm., 2 cols., 33 lines.

(ii) pp. 3-4. Vetus Testamentum (Gen 5:29-7:4). Saec. XIII. 375 x 280 (302 x 242) mm., 2 cols., 29 lines.

(iii) pp. 297-298. Vita ss. Hadriani et soc. (B.H.L. 3744). Saec. XI<sup>1</sup>. 376 x 264 (300 x 201) mm., 2 cols., 34 lines.

123. There are Beneventan headings in red on pp. 273-281, 284-285, 288, 290-293, 295-297, 301, and corrections in Beneventan are found throughout these pages.

MONTE VERGINE, Biblioteca dell'Abbazia 4. Fol. 31r-v is palimpsest, the lower script being Beneventan saec. XI (*ut vid.*): Liturgica, with neums, 148 x 110 mm., 6 long lines visible. (*T. F. Kelly*)

MUNICH, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek

Clm 15826. Beneventan writing occurs on fols. 79v (l. 25 to end of page) and 96v (l. 9 to end of page). (*J. Mallet, V. Brown*)

Clm 29072 A: now Clm 29891/4.

NAPLES, Biblioteca Nazionale

VI AA 4. Fol. 1 is mended with a Beneventan strip 18 x 7 mm., parts of 15 lines surviving, which contains Sermones, saec. XI. More strips from the same codex are similarly used on fols. 207r, 214v, 260r; some of these strips contain Gregorius Magnus, Homiliae in evangelia 30.5, 6. (*F. Newton*)

VI B 12. Fol. 261r displays a pastedown from a Homiliarium in Beneventan saec. XII: 165 x 78 mm., 11 lines. For other parts of the same manuscript see p. 607 above under Naples (*T. F. Kelly*)

PESCOCOSTANZO, Gaetano Sabatini Collection Perg. 4: missing and presumed lost during World War II.

ROME, Abbazia di San Paolo fuori le Mura: S. N. All Beneventan items have been returned to the Benedictine abbey at Farfa (*S. Baiocchi*). Further information regarding shelf marks has yet to be obtained.

—, Biblioteca Angelica: 1496. The upper script in ordinary minuscule (by several hands) displays many Beneventan symptoms, of which some examples are: a characteristic initial with interlace and body of a dog (fol. 38r26), Beneventan *a* (fols. 90r22, 92r18, 103r1, 105r10, 109v13), large *e* (fols. 84r15-17, 91r7, 108v26-27, 126v2), *li*, *ri* and soft *ti* ligatures (fols. 91r32, 94r passim, 95r31-36, 108v25, 112r1, 137r20), and 3-sign for omitted *m* (fols. 72v4, 109r9, 120r23, 130v31). A number of folios are written entirely in Beneventan or display a few lines in this script: 84r8-10; 90r12-15; 91r34-36; 93v26, 29-36; 97v14 *ista*-100v26; 100v31 *facile*-101v15; 101v28-36; 102r4 *partibus*-102v; 107r9-11 *supradictis*, 17 *mellis*-19 *febres*; 108v11 *rigores*-21; 109r15 *facere*-16 *nescias*; 109v *ingestam*-12 *-enda*; 110v15-111v; 113v13 *illi*-117r8 *aqua*; 117r20 *secunda*-28 *talibus*; 117r29 *tamen*-118r3 *sinece*; 124r9-10; 124v34 *propterea*-36; 126v17-24 *est*; 127v35 *cata-plasma*-36; 130r9-13, 19-v6; 133v9 *man*-136r; 138v9 *diarriam*-12 *patitur*, 14 *frequenter*-18, 24 *viscerum*-27; 139r16 *faciunt*-17, 25 *fit*-36; 142r20. There are also

many instances of individual words in Beneventan, as on fols. 19v9, 91r33, 93v27, 109v16-36.

—, Biblioteca Vallicelliana

B 3. On fol. 9v there is a marginal note in Beneventan saec. XI<sup>2</sup>. Cf. Supino Martini, p. 167 and n. 65.

B 10. Corrections and additions in Beneventan are found on fols. 99vb14, 100vb22, 121va7, 152vb16, 181va. Cf. Supino Martini, p. 165 and n. 58.

D 42. Fols. 11-25 are palimpsest, with faint traces remaining of an unidentified text (written space 230 x 150 mm.), c. 20 long lines. Some letters in Beneventan saec. XI (*ut vid.*) are visible on fols. 11v, 13r, 19r, 20r, 25r. (T. F. Kelly)

T. XVIII. For other occurrences of Beneventan on fols. 47r and 187vb cf. R. E. Reynolds, 'Odilo and the *Treuga Dei* in Southern Italy: A Beneventan Manuscript Fragment', *Mediaeval Studies* 46 (1984) n. 25.

—, Università di Roma 'La Sapienza', Istituto di Paleografia, Perg. n.35: now PR 17. (A. Petrucci).

SALERNO, Archivio di Stato, Frammenti: now Frammenti 1. Part of only 1 folio survives.

SAN FRANCISCO, Bernard M. Rosenthal Collection: S. N. All 11 items were purchased by Bernard Quaritch in July 1987 and will be offered for sale in 1988-89. (R. A. Linenthal)

SOLOTHURN, Staatsarchiv, Handschriftensammlung S. N.: now 136. (H. Gutzwiller)

TRENTO, Lawrence Feininger Collection S. N. (Commentarius in Epistulas Pauli; Missale): now Trento, Museo degli Usi e Costumi della Gente Trentina di S. Michele all'Adige S. N. (presently on deposit in Trento, Museo Provinciale d'Arte, fondo Lawrence Feininger S. N.). The Missale and Farfa, Biblioteca dell'Abbazia AF 338 Musica XI (olim AB. F. Musica XI) are parts of the same manuscript (origin: Veroli or nearby region).

TURIN, Sion Segre-Amar Collection 141: now Geneva, Bibliothèque Publique et Universitaire Comites latentes 141.

VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana

Vat. lat. 14733 (a miscellany of fragments).

(i) fol. 30. A tiny scrap (Homiliae?), saec. XI<sup>1</sup>; 21 x 38 mm., 2 cols., parts of 5 lines. (V. Brown)

(ii) fol. 32. Patristica. Saec. XI in. 1 mutilated and badly damaged folio, 368 x 251 (290 x 188) mm., 2 cols., 35 lines. (F. Newton)

Ottob. lat. 1939. Fols. 1r-76r are in Beneventan, and a *titulus* in Beneventan has been added on fol. 77r; fols. 83r1-15, 88v12-37, 91v13-23 are also in Beneventan. The final fly-leaves (fols. 117-118) comprise a bifolium (the innermost of the quire), trimmed, in Beneventan saec. XI: Vita s. Eupraxiae (B.H.L. 2718; bound in reverse textual order), 285 x 195 mm., 38 long lines. Cf. Supino Martini, pp. 161-62 and nn. 45-47.

Stampati Barb. HH. I. 189 (fragment in the cover): now Vat. lat. 13501, fol. 41 (to judge from the entry 'hh. I. 189' on the fragment itself). (For ms. Vat. lat. 13501 cf. *The Beneventan Script*, p. 156).

# A SOUTH ITALIAN LITURGICO-CANONICAL MASS COMMENTARY\*

*Roger E. Reynolds*

## Introduction

- I. Date of the Correspondence and Mass Commentary
- II. Place of Origin of the Correspondence between Damasus and Jerome
- III. Forms of the Correspondence
- IV. Growth of the Mass Commentary
- V. Short Penitential Form
- VI. Intermediate Penitential Form
- VII. Tortosa Form
- VIII. Neapolitan Penitential Form
- IX. Extended Penitential Form
- X. Vulgate Form
- XI. Abbreviated Vulgate Form
- XII. Texts
  1. Short Correspondence Form with Brief Conclusion
  2. Short Correspondence Form with Long Conclusion
  3. Long Correspondence Form with Short Conclusion
  4. Long Correspondence Form with Long Conclusion
  5. Short Penitential Form
  6. Intermediate Penitential Form
  7. Tortosa Form
  8. Neapolitan Penitential Form
  9. Extended Penitential Form
  10. Vulgate Form
  11. Abbreviated Vulgate Form

\* For references to several manuscripts and secondary literature I am grateful to Professors Raymund Kottje and Robert Somerville.

## INTRODUCTION

IN his *Disquisitiones criticae* published in 1836, the canonist Augustin Theiner printed an ancient text regarding the hour of Mass.<sup>1</sup> Theiner's text begins with a correspondence between the fourth-century Pope Damasus I, who asks at what hour Mass should be celebrated, and a response by St. Jerome, who reminds his papal interrogator that the First Council of Nicea had declared that Mass was not to be celebrated after the third hour on Sundays and between the third and ninth hour on other days. Theiner's text then continues with what is one of the most remarkable and fanciful commentaries on the Mass produced in the early Middle Ages. After the correspondence between Damasus and Jerome the text explains at great length why Mass should not be said after the third hour, why the priest is to celebrate with two other persons, and why he should wear seven vestments. Then seven 'trinities' in the order and celebration of the Mass are explained: (1) the lights used at Mass with their wax, wick, and flame; (2) the incense with its odor and fire; (3) the bread, wine, and water; (4) the *tersanctus*; (5) the triform nature of the term for the celebrant as *sa-cer-dos* and *pres-bi-ter*; (6) the tripled corporal on the altar and over the chalice and oblation, and the cover on the chalice; and (7) the threefold *Agnus Dei*. The text then concludes with an admonition to priests to celebrate as directed in the commentary.

Theiner's text is found in many manuscripts written in Beneventan script or with Beneventan-script symptoms and in manuscripts with south Italian connections. In fact, his own text was based on the codex Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Vat. lat. 1339 (V5 below), with Beneventan-script symptoms. But if the texts in these manuscripts are compared with Theiner's, it is clear that his is defective in several ways. Most important, it lacks significant introductory material found in the manuscripts explaining that the correspondence between Damasus and Jerome had been occasioned by a controversy in Rome as to when Mass should be said.

Theiner's defective text has been reproduced as recently as 1974 in the supplement to Migne's *Patrologia latina*<sup>2</sup> together with a list of manuscripts said to contain the text. But, strangely, the texts in these manuscripts are all a vastly reduced version in which there is simply: (1) the question Damasus put to Jerome; (2) Jerome's response that the Council of Nicea had forbidden solemn Mass to be said after the third hour on Sundays and from the fifth to the eighth on other days; and (3) a short, almost ungracious response by Damasus that Jerome is

<sup>1</sup> *Disquisitiones criticae in praecipuas canonum et decretalium collectiones seu Sylloges Gallandianae dissertationum de vetustis canonum collectionibus continuatio* (Rome, 1836), pp. 301-303.

<sup>2</sup> PLS 5.396 f.

correct. This reduced version of the text was printed without comment as long ago as 1899 by Aloisius Knoepfler in a footnote to his edition of the *Liber de exordiis* of Walafrid Strabo.<sup>3</sup>

A decision on the hour of the Mass attributed to the Council of Nicea and connected with Damasus has long been known to modern scholars, at least back to the time of Baronius in the sixteenth century, and is reported in Mansi's *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*.<sup>4</sup> Moreover, references to the long form of the text not unlike Theiner's had appeared in a variety of incipit lists of canons in early medieval canonical collections.<sup>5</sup> Occasionally in more recent secondary literature brief references have been made to the text in either Theiner's long or Knoepfler's short forms.<sup>6</sup> But it was not until 1970 that a reasonably accurate critical edition of Theiner's long form was printed by Mario Fornasari in his partial edition of the south Italian canonical *Collection in Five Books*.<sup>7</sup> Unfortunately, this new edition is at odds not only with Theiner's text but also with all of the manuscripts of this collection. Further, in Fornasari's *Initia canonum* listing the occurrences of the text in early medieval canonical collections, our text is cited as appearing only in the *Collection in Five Books*.<sup>8</sup>

In view of this somewhat haphazard treatment and editing of the text, it is appropriate that a more systematic examination of its origins and development be undertaken and that its various forms be critically edited. New evidence largely from manuscripts from southern Italy or with south Italian connections dramatically illustrates how layer by layer the text grew into at least eleven recensions in almost three dozen manuscripts. Using this new material, this study will focus on

<sup>3</sup> *Liber de exordiis et incrementis quarundam in observationibus ecclesiasticis rerum*, 2nd edition (Munich, 1899), pp. 70 f.

<sup>4</sup> Caesar Baronius, *Annales ecclesiastici* (Angers, 1866), 5.493: 'Prohibitum etiam ex praescripto (ut ibi ponitur) Nicaeni canonis, ne ante horam tertiam diebus festis Missae canerentur, aliis vero diebus a media hora quarta usque ad nonam facere liceret.' On the citation in Mansi 3.642, see Raymund Kottje, *Studien zum Einfluss des Alten Testaments auf Recht und Liturgie des frühen Mittelalters* (6.-8. Jahrhundert), 2nd edition (Bonner historische Forschungen; Bonn, 1970), p. 59.

<sup>5</sup> e.g., PL 138.413 (III.45); Theiner, *Disquisitiones*, p. 304.

<sup>6</sup> Franz Zimmermann, *Die Abendmesse in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Vienna, 1914), pp. 108 f., noting what is presumably the text known to Baronius; Michel Andrieu, *Les Ordines romani du haut moyen âge* 1 (Spicilegium sacrum lovaniense. Études et documents 11; Louvain, 1931), p. 342, citing Knoepfler's edition and listing manuscripts with the short correspondence alone; E. Dekkers, 'La messe du soir à la fin de l'antiquité et au moyen âge: notes historiques', *Sacris erudiri* 7 (1955) 117 n. 5, citing Theiner's text and what he calls an extract of it in our ninth-century codex G below; *Clavis patrum latinorum*, ed. Eligius Dekker and Aemilius Gaar, 2nd edition (Steenbrugge, 1961), no. 633b; and Bernard Lambert, *Bibliotheca hieronymiana manuscripta: la tradition manuscrite des oeuvres de saint Jérôme* 3A (Steenbrugge, 1970), no. 355, noting Theiner's edition and listing manuscripts of several versions of the correspondence only.

<sup>7</sup> *Collectio canonum in v libris* (lib. i-iii) (CCM 6; Turnhout, 1970), pp. 413-15.

<sup>8</sup> *Initia canonum a primaevis collectionibus usque ad Decretum Gratiani*, vol. 1: A-G, ed. M. Fornasari (Monumenta Italiae ecclesiastica, Subsidia 1; Florence, 1972), no. 1635<sup>1</sup>.

the curious correspondence between Damasus and Jerome and the accompanying Mass commentary by tracing its spectacular growth and diffusion in its liturgical, canonical, codicological, and historical contexts. To be sure, some of the lines of development to be sketched here are conjectural and may be modified as other manuscripts come to light. But the text as a whole has been neglected far too long by scholars; and now that sufficient manuscript evidence has been found to illustrate its development, the text deserves to be singled out for more extensive analysis and to be edited critically in its various recensions.

## I

## DATE OF THE CORRESPONDENCE AND MASS COMMENTARY

It has long been recognized that although the text as a whole is attributed to Damasus and Jerome, the long Mass commentary, whose colorful contents will be described in more detail later, is clearly not from the patristic period. It is far too fanciful and too far-fetched. But could the simple, brief correspondence between Damasus and Jerome on the hour of the Mass be authentic? Damasus and Jerome certainly did correspond on many matters, some liturgical, but there appears to be no evidence of a controversy in fourth-century Rome over the hour at which Mass could be celebrated and certainly no canon of the First Council of Nicea on such a subject. By at least the early sixth century, however, there might indeed have been more concern over the hour of the Mass, perhaps in Rome itself. Evidence for this is found in the *Liber pontificalis*, where one of the early second-century popes, Telesphorus, is said to have directed that aside from Christmas, no Masses were to be said before the *cursus* of the third hour:

Hic constituit ut ... natalem Domini noctu missas celebrarentur; nam omni tempore, ante horae tertiae cursum nullus praesumeret missas celebrare, qua hora Dominus noster ascendit crucem....<sup>9</sup>

Here the *cursus* of the third hour may simply mean the third hour or about 9 a.m., but since the term *cursus* also has liturgical overtones, the term may also mean the divine office celebrated at the third hour, perhaps something like the office of terce celebrated as a type of foremass in the early Middle Ages.<sup>10</sup> If this were the case, the text attributed to Telesphorus may indicate that there should normally be no Mass before the office of terce at about 9 a.m., and that the Mass thereafter should be celebrated during the time of Christ's sacrifice.

<sup>9</sup> *Le Liber pontificalis: texte, introduction et commentaire* 1, ed. L. Duchesne, 2nd edition (Paris, 1955), p. 129.

<sup>10</sup> Joseph A. Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite: Its Origins and Development (Missarum Sollemnia)* 1, trans. Francis A. Brunner (New York, 1951), pp. 247 f.

Legislation or quasi-legislation on the hour of the Mass continued to be reported in various early medieval sources. In the *Bobbio Missal*, for example, written perhaps as early as the late seventh or early eighth century in northern Italy,<sup>11</sup> there is a corrupt text, perhaps copied from an older exemplar, with a regulation on the hour of the Mass justified again with events in Christ's life:

INCEPIT INQUISITIO DE LEGE. AD MESAM CELEBRARE.

Si necessitas fuerit ad galurum cantu lecet sacerdotes traderem et consacrare sacrificium et de ora nonam usque ad uesperum septema et octauam ora nun es iustum consacrare sacrificium as autem duas oras quas christus in crocem pendit tenebre facte s<unt> he duas horas in qua sul et lona et omniam sidira tenebrecati sunt et os ualleum racientem christo perdederunt nec sacrificium ofererint non lecet set elas et elam septema firia com eueneret autem diaem paxe mesa in eo diae non celebr<e>tur idio et elas doas oras omnebus diaebus septema et hoctauam misa cantare non lecet quia tenebre uocate sunt e pependentem christo dei filium in crucem elimenta trimuerunt in uigilias enim pahe corus misit in media noctes et pus inplere debet quia media noctem christo de sepulcrum surexit citeris diaebus a deluculum diae usque ad crepuscolum noctes per sumptas duas oras licet sacrificium tradere et consecrare.<sup>12</sup>

It is perhaps significant that this text is adjacent to an Ordinal of Christ with its dominical sanctions<sup>13</sup> and not far removed from the Pseudo-Hieronymian *De omnes cursus* (sic)<sup>14</sup> on the hours of the divine office in which it is pointed out that at the third hour Christ was crucified and the Holy Spirit descended to the apostles, and at the sixth hour Christ ascended the cross.

By the late eighth and ninth centuries the decision attributed to the second-century Pope Telesphorus was being widely circulated in a variety of forms beyond the *Liber pontificalis*. These different forms seem to reflect some confusion as to what exactly was meant by the decision. Walafrid Strabo in his *De exordiis*, for example, simply repeated the text of Telesphorus, but added a theme that would later appear in the Mass commentary attached to the correspondence between Damasus and Jerome, namely, that there was to be no fasting on Sundays and feast days:

<sup>11</sup> Klaus Gamber, *Codices liturgici latini antiquiores* 1, 2nd edition (Spicilegii friburgensis subsidia 1; Fribourg, 1968), p. 168.

<sup>12</sup> *The Bobbio Missal. A Gallican Mass-Book* (MS. Paris. Lat. 13246), ed. E. A. Lowe (Henry Bradshaw Society 58; London, 1920), pp. 177 f.

<sup>13</sup> Roger E. Reynolds, *The Ordinals of Christ from Their Origins to the Twelfth Century* (Beiträge zur Geschichte und Quellenkunde des Mittelalters 7; Berlin-New York, 1978), p. 58.

<sup>14</sup> *ibid.*, p. 73 n. 15; and on the use of this text in related manuscripts, see Jonathan Glenn Black, *The Daily Cursus, the Week, and the Psalter in the Divine Office and in Carolingian Devotion* (Diss. Toronto, 1987), pp. 285-89.



Nam Telesphorus papa constituit, ut nullo tempore ante horae tertiae cursum ullus praesumeret missas celebrare, qua hora Dominus noster secundum Marci evangelium crucifixus asseritur. Inter haec notandum neque ieiunandum in dominicis et festis maioribus, ubi non cogit necessitas, sicut et canones ostendunt, ...<sup>15</sup>

Amalarius of Metz in his *Liber officialis* repeated the account of Telesphorus, but then without any reference to the *cursus* said that it was fitting to say Mass at the third hour:

Memoratus papa Telesphorus scripsit quo tempore primo diei liceret missam caelebrare. Legitur in Gestis episcopalibus dixisse memoratum papam ut ante horae tertiae cursum nullus praesumeret missas caelebrare, qua hora Dominus noster ascendit in crucem. Si enim propterea aptum est iuxta memoratum papam tempus horae tertiae caelebrationi missae, quia in eo legitur secundum Marcum crucem Christum ascendisse ....<sup>16</sup>

Finally, the forgers of the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals reported Telesphorus as saying that Mass was not to be said before the third hour of the day, because Christ had ascended the cross at that hour and also because the Holy Spirit had descended on the apostles:

Reliquis enim temporibus missarum caelebrationes ante horam diei tertiam minime sunt caelebrandae, quia eadem hora et Dominus crucifixus et super apostolos Spiritus Sanctus descendisse legitur.<sup>17</sup>

In the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals all reference to the *cursus* of the third hour has disappeared, perhaps reflecting the tendency in the second half of the ninth and early tenth centuries for the vesting prayers and so-called accession prayers to replace the office of terce as the rites of preparation for the Mass.<sup>18</sup>

Given this seeming confusion in the ninth century as to what the second-century Pope Telesphorus had meant, it is perhaps not surprising to find the author of our correspondence state that in the fourth century another pope, Damasus, the great western father, Jerome, and also the first ecumenical council of the Church had all said that Mass was not to be celebrated after the third hour. The general confusion reflected in the texts as to whether Mass was to be celebrated before, at, or after the third hour suggests that our correspondence between Damasus and Jerome was compiled sometime between the sixth-century *Liber pontificalis* and the late eighth century and probably not long before it was entered in a corrupt

<sup>15</sup> ed. Knoepfler, pp. 70 f.

<sup>16</sup> *Liber officialis* 3.42.1 f.; *Amalarii episcopi Opera liturgica omnia* 2, ed. Jean Michel Hanssens (Studi e testi 139; Vatican City, 1948), pp. 378 f.

<sup>17</sup> *Decretales pseudo-isidorianae et Capitula Angilramni*, ed. Paul Hinschius (Leipzig, 1863), pp. 110 f.

<sup>18</sup> On this see Roger E. Reynolds, 'Mass, Liturgy of the' in *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* 7.184.

form by an early ninth-century hand into a late eighth-century Stuttgart manuscript (S below) of the canonical *Collectio Vetus Gallica*.<sup>19</sup>

## II

### PLACE OF ORIGIN OF THE CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN DAMASUS AND JEROME

As is clear from the dates of the manuscripts containing the text in any form, the oldest contain only the correspondence, suggesting that the Mass commentary was a later accretion. But do the origins of these early manuscripts with the correspondence alone shed any light on the place of origin of the text? Southern Germany or the Rhaetian Alps might be suggested since the three earliest codices were written in the vicinities of Chur (S), St. Gall (G), and Regensburg (Pr) respectively.<sup>20</sup> Nonetheless, this same version with minor variants can be found in a codex in Beneventan script of the eleventh century; and a slightly different text of the correspondence with a longer conclusion is heavily represented in Beneventan-script codices from the tenth century and beyond [Text 2 below]. Thus, although the earliest manuscripts of the correspondence suggest an origin in regions far removed from southern Italy, it is not beyond the realm of possibility that even the correspondence itself originated in southern Italy and was taken north in the late eighth century.

## III

### FORMS OF THE CORRESPONDENCE

Thus far four distinct forms of the short correspondence between Damasus and Jerome have been found, and these are edited below as Texts 1 through 4. Text 1, the shortest form and the one found in the oldest manuscripts, is curious in that the concluding reply by Damasus appears to be a somewhat crude addition, probably intended to give papal approval to Jerome's citation of the canon attributed to Nicea. As it stands, it is unclear if this was the original conclusion or an abbreviation or summary of the longer and more gracious reply by Damasus reported in Text 2, found in the southern Italian manuscripts of the tenth century and later. In its oldest witness, MC1, the longer conclusion of Text 2 is corrupt,

<sup>19</sup> Hubert Mordek, *Kirchenrecht und Reform im Frankenreich. Die Collectio Vetus Gallica, die älteste systematische Kanonessammlung des fränkischen Gallien. Studien und Edition* (Beiträge zur Geschichte und Quellenkunde des Mittelalters 1; Berlin-New York, 1975), pp. 294 f.

<sup>20</sup> *ibid.*, noting that the first part of S is related to Italian collections.

and possibly northern copyists, unable to make sense of the longer conclusion, simply omitted it.

The longer correspondence forms in Texts 3 and 4 are interesting in their expansion of the Nicene decision to include additional hours on ordinary days when Mass can be said, an expansion that is in some ways reminiscent of the text on the hour of the Mass in the *Bobbio Missal* noted above. In the Long Correspondence Form with Short Conclusion [Text 3] it is specified that on (feast?) days it is not licit to say Mass from the fifth to the seventh hour; and on ordinary days it is licit to say Mass from early morning to the fourth hour and from the eighth to the twelfth hour. According to the Long Correspondence Form with Long Conclusion [Text 4] on ordinary days it is licit to celebrate Mass from early morning through every hour to the twelfth. The difference in these hours in the two manuscripts probably reflects the continuing uncertainty beyond the ninth century as to exactly when Mass could be said, a phenomenon also found in the variants of Text 2, where in MC1 it is stated that Mass is not to be said on other days from the fifth to the eighth hour, while other manuscripts limit the celebration of Mass from the fifth to the seventh hour.

Although Texts 2 through 4 appear to contain a more complete form of the correspondence between Damasus and Jerome, it was nonetheless the truncated form of the very early Stuttgart, St. Gall, and Prague manuscripts that had the widest broadcast, especially in liturgical codices. In these liturgical manuscripts, the short form of the correspondence is often placed next to other texts dealing with aspects of the Mass that would be treated in the longer Mass commentaries. Among the texts contiguous with our brief correspondence are the *Capitula* of Theodulf of Orléans, the *De exordiis* of Walafrid Strabo, the *Liber officialis* of Amalarius of Metz, and other well-known eighth- and ninth-century Mass commentaries, including one beginning with the salutation *Dominus vobiscum*. Several witnesses with the truncated form, written during the ninth century and later, were copied in southern Germany, but at least by the early eleventh century (and probably before) the texts in them were being included in south Italian liturgical and canonical manuscripts by scribes writing in Beneventan script, as is seen in L below.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>21</sup> On south German elements in L see Mordek, *ibid.*, pp. 104 f. For the vast liturgico-canonical florilegium in L see Letha Mahadevan, "Überlieferung und Verbreitung des Bussbuchs "Capitula Iudiciorum", *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte*, kan. Abt. 72 (1986) 24-28. It is interesting that this codex contains the second epistle of Clement with additions in a recension like that found in the Beneventan-script fragment of Goslar, Stadtarchiv S. N. (see above, p. 600). It also contains the Mass commentary *Dominus vobiscum*, attributed to Jerome, on which see Roger E. Reynolds, 'Pseudonymous liturgica in early medieval canon law collections' in *Fälschungen im Mittelalter. Internationaler Kongress der Monumenta Germaniae Historica, München, 15.-18. September 1986* (Schriften der Monumenta Germaniae Historica 33.2; Hanover, 1988), n. 36.

That either Text 1 or 2 survived beyond the ninth century at all was due probably not so much to the intrinsic validity or usefulness of the text itself as to its routine inclusion in series of other texts, such as the closely related manuscripts V1, V2, V3, and W1<sup>22</sup> with Text 1, or C, Ma1, and P1 with Text 2 embedded in a vast south Italian florilegium.<sup>23</sup> In fact, the validity and authenticity of the correspondence forms could be and probably were questioned on two grounds by at least the tenth century. First, as has been seen, the correspondence could be taken to contradict the Telesphorus text, a text widely known and copied by the early tenth century in scores of canonical and liturgical manuscripts, including many containing the correspondence between Damasus and Jerome.<sup>24</sup> Second, by at least the early tenth century it must have been noticed that the correspondence contained a reference to a decision of the First Council of Nicea nowhere to be found in the normative text of twenty canons of that council. There was, of course, a tradition in the West well into the ninth century that the Council had enacted some seventy canons,<sup>25</sup> and perhaps it might early have been thought that the reference in our correspondence was to one of the fifty 'lost' canons of Nicea. But this tradition of fifty 'lost' Nicene canons had been severely attacked in the mid-ninth century in the celebrated controversy between the two Hincmars, and hence any so-called 'lost' Nicene canons, including ours, would probably have been considered tainted by the tenth century.

#### IV

##### GROWTH OF THE MASS COMMENTARY

Despite the questionable nature of our correspondence, it did survive, but as the foundation for layer upon layer of commentary on the meaning of the eucharistic liturgy. Such layers would seem to have developed in southern Italy since testimony

<sup>22</sup> B, V1, V2, V3, W1 and M are all vast florilegia of canonical and liturgical texts, including Mass commentaries and the *Ordines romani*, whose relationships have been treated extensively by Andrieu, *Les Ordines romani*, pp. 84-89, 238-40, 294-300.

<sup>23</sup> C, Ma1 and P1 contain a vast miscellany of texts often studied individually or as a whole. See, e.g., Reynolds, *Ordinals of Christ*, pp. 91 f. for bibliography, and Herbert Bloch, 'Der Autor der "Graphia aurea urbis Romae"', *Deutsches Archiv* 40 (1984) 150 n. 259, citing the Harvard dissertation on the florilegium by Elizabeth Susan Lott. Our text in MC1 is embedded in a florilegium and followed by the explanation of the parts of the Creed according to their apostolic origin.

<sup>24</sup> The Telesphorus canon appears, e.g., in the *Collectio canonica ambrosiana* 2.233 (*Collezionei canoniche milanesi del secolo xii*, ed. Giorgio Picasso [Pubblicazioni dell'Università Cattolica del S. Cuore, Saggi e Ricerche, 3rd Ser., Scienze storiche 2; Milan, 1969], p. 247).

<sup>25</sup> Horst Fuhrmann, *Einfluss und Verbreitung der pseudoisidorischen Fälschungen von ihrem Auftauchen bis in die neuere Zeit* (Schriften der Monumenta Germaniae Historica 24.3; Stuttgart, 1974), pp. 680 f., 702 f.

to them is found largely in codices written in Beneventan script or with Beneventan-script symptoms and in codices related in some way to the south Italian canonical *Collection in Five Books* or the *Collection in Nine Books*. The initial strata of transformation of the correspondence into Mass commentary may go back perhaps to the early tenth century because it has been argued on textual grounds that the *Collection in Nine Books*, which contains the longest version of our Mass commentary, was compiled by the early tenth century.<sup>26</sup> Moreover, the earliest manuscript to contain any version of the correspondence and Mass commentary, V7, is dated to c. 1000, and the text bears some resemblance to that in the *Collection in Nine Books*.<sup>27</sup>

The process of transforming the early brief correspondence into the Mass commentary probably began when its potential conflict with the widely known Telesphorus canon was noted. As a result, two changes in the correspondence itself were introduced. First, a brief prologue was added to explain that the entire Roman Church was embroiled in controversy over the hour of the Mass and hence Damasus had written to Jerome for advice. Then, the letter of Damasus was altered and improved upon slightly, and Jerome's reply was also augmented slightly with the statement that on ferial days Mass was not to be celebrated from the third to the ninth hour. With these rather minor modifications in place, imaginative liturgical commentators then began to graft onto this stock of the correspondence their own colorful explanations of the elements of the eucharist.

## V

### SHORT PENITENTIAL FORM

The first transformation of the correspondence into a Mass commentary proper appears in texts mutually related by an intruded penitential canon, and hence this group is placed under the general rubric of Penitential Forms. Although the first form is found in twelfth-century manuscripts, its brevity probably indicates that it represents the earliest stratum in the growth from simple correspondence to Mass commentary. In this Short Penitential Form [Text 5] the commentator completely replaces the conclusion of the Correspondence Forms of Texts 1 through 4 with a longer description of the reception of Jerome's response in Rome where it was verified that the 318 Fathers, inflamed as they were by the Holy Spirit, had indeed made the decision in the presence of the emperor Constantine that anyone who

<sup>26</sup> Paul Fournier and Gabriel Le Bras, *Histoire des collections canoniques en occident depuis les Fausses Décrétales jusqu'au Décret de Gratien* 1 (Paris, 1931), p. 346.

<sup>27</sup> On the date of V7 see Paola Supino Martini, *Roma e l'area grafica romanesca (secoli x-xii)* (Biblioteca di Scrittura e civiltà 1; Alessandria, 1987), p. 74.

might dare say Mass after the third hour on Sunday would be anathematized. Then the commentator explains why Mass cannot be said after the third hour on Sunday. Strangely, he uses one of the very points Telesphorus in the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals had raised in objecting to Mass being said before the third hour, namely, that it was at the third hour that the Holy Spirit had descended on the apostles, whose successors were the 318 Fathers. Then, borrowing further from an idea in Walafrid Strabo's text of Telesphorus, the commentator adds that fasting and abstinence are also forbidden on Sundays from the third hour on. To enforce this he uses a penitential canon, something like that in the *Penitentialia Vallicelliana* I and II,<sup>28</sup> threatening with penance for seven days anyone who through negligence fasts on Sundays. Returning to the confused problem as to when the sacrifice may be offered, the commentator further says that on ferial days the sacrifice may not be offered 'a media hora tertia usque in horam nonam', because it was at that time that Christ had made his own sacrifice on the cross. To conclude his text, the commentator takes up a theme found neither in the correspondence between Damasus and Jerome nor in the Telesphorus and Walafrid material but one debated extensively in the eighth and ninth centuries, namely, how many persons are necessary to celebrate Mass.<sup>29</sup> The commentator agrees heartily with his ninth-century forebears that it is improper for a priest to celebrate alone, but his reason is not the usual ninth-century argument that a single priest cannot give the salutation *Dominus vobiscum* without at least one other person present. Rather, the commentator argues that when Christ made his sacrifice, he did so not alone, but between two thieves.

## VI

### INTERMEDIATE PENITENTIAL FORM

The next accretions to the correspondence and Mass commentary are found in an eleventh-century codex, Va1, written in Beneventan script which contains other liturgical commentaries, including Amalarius' *Expositio* I with separable preface,<sup>30</sup> and the early Carolingian *Dominus vobiscum*. In this Intermediate Penitential

<sup>28</sup> 1.108, 'Qui in die dominica per negligentiam jejunaverit et opera fecerit aut si valneaverit, vii dies peniteat, si pro damnatione diei dominicae hoc facit, abominabitur ab ecclesia catholica sicut judeus', and 2.75, 'Qui jejunit in die dominico sponte, anathema sit; qui operatur in die dominico, vii dies peniteat; qui contemnit indictum ab ecclesia jejuniium, xl dies peniteat' (*Die Bussbücher und die Bussdisziplin der Kirche nach handschriftlichen Quellen dargestellt*, ed. Herm. Jos. Schmitz [Mainz, 1883], 1.325, 385).

<sup>29</sup> See Jean M. Hanssens, 'Fungiturne minister missae privatae diaconi et subdiaconi vicibus?', *Epemerides liturgicae* 48 (1934) 410-12.

<sup>30</sup> On which see Roger E. Reynolds, 'Unity and Diversity in Carolingian Canon Law Collections: The Case of the *Collectio Hibernensis*' in *Carolingian Essays: Andrew W. Mellon Lectures in Early Christian Studies*, ed. Uta-Renate Blumenthal (Washington, D. C., 1983), p. 126.

Form [Text 6] the references to the Council of Nicea and the inflaming Holy Spirit seem to have provided the impetus for expanded trinitarian and pneumatological commentary on the parts of the Mass. Indeed, in the margin of the manuscript, there is a gloss on the trinity at the crucifixion, Christ and the two thieves, where the malefactors are identified as Aspalorga and Alaban, not the usual Gestas, Dismas, Limas, or the like. The commentator seems to have felt that the case against a single priest at Mass should be bolstered, and this he did with four arguments. First, he introduces the argument from the salutation *Dominus vobiscum* and improves upon it by saying that two additional ministers must be present at Mass because if only one were present, the priest's salutation would be *Dominus tecum*, not *Dominus vobiscum*. Second, the commentator argues that two ministers with the priest must be present for there to be a perfect reflection of the Trinity in the Mass. Third, Christ himself had said, 'Where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in the midst of them'.<sup>31</sup> Finally, in the Scriptures it is said that on the testimony of three witnesses matters are confirmed before God and men (1 Jo 5:7-8).

Yet another stratum is added to the text as the commentator lists the seven vestments a priest must wear or carry at Mass: the alb, cincture, amice, stole, chasuble, maniple, and towel. Although in later versions of the text the towel or sudarium is glossed as a corporal [Text 7 and Text 10, MC2], it appears here to be a strange doublet for the maniple. No reason for the septiformity of vestments is given, and the doublet of both maniple and towel suggests that the traditional six vestments have been expanded to seven for a reason not expressed. In any event, 'et trilecem', perhaps referring to a triple-fiber or triple-folded towel or sudarium used to place the sacrifice on the altar, is connected with the Trinity.

Having dealt with the septiformity of vestments, the commentator turns to a trinitarian scheme wherein each of three objects necessary in the Mass is seen as having a trinity within itself. First, light is necessary at Mass because otherwise the sacrifice would be like that of a blind man. But the light must be lit with a flame for there to be a trinity, that is, in the oil or wax, in the wick, and in the flame. Again, one suspects that these three objects should have been compared directly to the three persons of the Trinity, but here for reasons unknown the comparisons have been omitted. Second, incense is necessary at the sacrifice because, when the angels of Satan fell to earth, they made such a stench that the priest must cense the altar so that the devil will flee and the odor of incense can rise to God.<sup>32</sup> But

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Theodulf of Orléans, *Capitula* I, c. 7, ed. Peter Brommer (MGH *Leges, capitula episcoporum* 1; Munich, 1984), p. 108.

<sup>32</sup> For similar arguments in later commentaries, see Lothar of Segni (Innocent III), *De sacro altaris mysterio libri sex* 2.17, 58 (PL 217.808, 834) and William Durandus, *Rationale* 4.10.5 (*Prochiron, vulgo Rationale divinatorum officiorum, Gulielmo Durando, I. V. D. celeberrimo, mimatensi episcopo, autore* [Lyons, 1551], fol. 63v).

like the light at the sacrifice, the incense must be lit with flame for there to be a trinity: in the incense itself, in the odor, and in the fire. The third trinity of objects at the Mass, according to the commentator, is in the oblata, the bread, wine, and water. If solely bread were used, only the Father would be present; if bread and wine alone were used, only the Father and Son would be present. So all three, the bread of the Father, the wine of the Son, and the water of the Holy Spirit, are necessary in the Mass.

## VII

### THE TORTOSA FORM

Three of the explanations that seem to be missing in the Intermediate Penitential Form are supplied by yet another, long recension of the correspondence and Mass commentary in a codex of the chapter library of the cathedral at Tortosa [Text 7]. This codex was written in Beneventan script perhaps of the tenth or eleventh century, but in the early twelfth century the text was erased and replaced by a number of liturgical commentaries, including ours.<sup>33</sup> As it now stands in the Tortosa manuscript, the text of our Mass commentary is corrupt; although it lacks the penitential canon common to the Penitential Forms, it is related to them. Moreover, it contains some of the explanations missing in the Short and Intermediate Penitential Forms and hence is of significant value in reconstructing the text as a whole. The first of these explanations is an expansion of the argument that Mass should not be celebrated 'a media hora tertia usque in mediam horam octavam' because Christ was on the cross at those hours. The commentator adds that therefore the angels cannot accept the priest's sacrifice at those hours. The second expansion deals with the vestments; it is clearly stated that the seven vestments, including the 'corporalem triplicem', refer to the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit. The third expansion explains that in the trinity of the burning light the wax represents the Father, the wick the Son, and the fire the Holy Spirit. In the Tortosa version this third expansion seems to have been misplaced,<sup>34</sup> and while later texts would omit the specific comparison of the wax to the Father, the wick to the Son, and the fire to the Holy Spirit, the general comparison of the light to the Trinity would remain, still misplaced.

In addition to these expansions of the earlier Penitential Forms the Tortosa Form continues by enlarging the trinity of objects in the Mass to a septiformity.

<sup>33</sup> See Roger E. Reynolds, 'South Italian *Liturgica* and *Canonistica* in Catalonia (New York, Hispanic Society of America ms. HC 380/819)', *Mediaeval Studies* 49 (1987) 484; and for the same Mass exposition as that appearing before ours see Jean-Paul Bouhot, 'Les sources de l'*Expositio missae* de Remi d'Auxerre', *Revue des études augustinienne*s 26 (1980) 157.

<sup>34</sup> This reference to the light is placed after the fourth trinity of the *tersanctus*, but it fits more properly with the discussion of the light in the first of the trinities.



First, there is an obvious trinity in the *tersanctus*: Sanctus Sanctus Sanctus. Second, in the terms for the priest himself there is a trinity. In one of these terms, *sa-cer-dos*, there are clearly three elements: *sa-* signifying the Father, *cer-* signifying the Son, and *-dos* signifying the Holy Spirit. Moreover, in the term *pres-bi-ter* there is also a trinity: *pres-* signifying the primary person of the Trinity, the Father; *bi-* signifying the binary person of the Trinity, the Son; and *-ter* obviously signifying the tertiary person of the Trinity, the Holy Spirit. The Tortosa commentator then adds enigmatically that a trinity is also signified by the tripled corporal on the altar, but he fails to elucidate this point. As the seventh trinity in the Mass the commentator finally points out that in the threefold Agnus Dei the Trinity is clearly present. There is then a brief conclusion supported by Christ's words in Mt 15:14 and Lc 6:39, which urges priests to celebrate Mass as has been explained. Appended to the commentary in the Tortosa Form are two texts. The first, urging the priest to celebrate in a state of cleanliness, would come to be reflected in the Mass commentary itself. The other, a text regarding the necessity of two ministers and the celebrant at Mass, is based on a canon attributed to Pope Sothar and can be found in P2, the manuscript of the canonical *Collection in Four Books* following Text 3.

## VIII

### THE NEAPOLITAN PENITENTIAL FORM

Most of the commentary in the Tortosa manuscript is found in N, an early twelfth-century Neapolitan codex with Beneventan-script symptoms containing a fragment of Burchard's *Decretum*, to which several additional canons, including our Mass commentary, have been added by a different hand.<sup>35</sup> As in the other Penitential Forms, the penitential canon is intruded after the prohibition of fasting on Sundays and feast days, but four new elements have been added in the Neapolitan Form [Text 8]. First, there is a puzzling statement in the section on the light at Mass that this is a 'sententia sanctae trinitatis', or signification of the Holy Trinity. Second, after the misplaced general comparison of the burning light to the Trinity found in the Tortosa Form, there is added an admonition to priests, reflected in the texts attached to the Tortosa Form, to celebrate in cleanliness and chastity. Third, the strange reference in the Tortosa manuscript to the trinitarian significance of the corporal on the altar is elucidated: it is the tripled (corporal?) on the altar and over the chalice and oblata, and the cover (pall?) over the chalice that signify the Trinity. Fourth, the enigmatic reference earlier to the 'sententia

<sup>35</sup> On this manuscript see Hubert Mordek, 'Handschriftenforschungen in Italien: I. Zum Überlieferung des Dekrets Bischof Burchards von Worms', *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken* 51 (1971) 647, 649 n. 56.

sanctae trinitatis' is clarified when it is specified that there are in the Mass commentary seven trinitarian significations representing the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit: the light, incense, oblata, tersanctus, priest with his triform names, corporal on the altar and over the chalice and oblata, and the cover over the chalice, and threefold Agnus Dei. Finally, the conclusion has been expanded, but Christ's words have been omitted.

## IX

### THE EXTENDED PENITENTIAL FORM

The longest form of the Mass commentary [Text 9] is used as c. xlvi of L. III of the south Italian *Collection in Nine Books*, a collection unique to the eleventh-century codex V4 in Beneventan script. The text here is substantially like that in the Neapolitan Penitential Form, although there is the tripled corporal on the altar with no reference to the oblata and cover on the chalice. The most important difference, however, is that instead of the rather simple trinitarian explanations of the terms for the priest there is a fantastic word-letter trinitarian explanation of the abbreviation for the terms *sacerdos* and *presbiter*. First, the letters P, F, and double S are said to represent the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and the intercalated letters S, C, and D, being the abbreviated form of the word *sacerdos*, represent three operations of the persons of the Trinity. Then the letters P and F signify the Father and Son, and the double S the operation of the Holy Spirit. The intercalated letters P, B, and T, as the abbreviated form of the word *presbiter*, signify the operations of the Trinity. The consummation of all this comes when the letters of the abbreviation of *sacerdos* and *presbiter* are equated directly with the three persons of the Trinity.

## X

### THE VULGATE FORM

This form of the correspondence and Mass commentary [Text 10] has the widest circulation and appears in at least ten manuscripts. It very much resembles the Neapolitan and Extended Penitential Forms, but there are several differences. First, the Vulgate Form lacks the penitential canon. Second, like the Tortosa Form the Vulgate Form notes that Mass may not be said during the time that Christ hung upon the cross because during this time the angels in heaven are occupied in accepting his sacrifice. But the Vulgate Form adds to this a question, 'Ergo quid prodest illud sacrificium?' Third, the trinitarian equivalences of the terms *sacerdos* and *presbiter* as found in the Neapolitan Form are repeated. Fourth, the expla-

nation of the trinity of the tripled corporal on the altar and above the chalice and oblata, and the cover over the chalice found in the Neapolitan Form appears here.

Whereas the earlier recensions of the correspondence and Mass commentary, such as those of the Penitential and Tortosa Forms, are to be found usually in single, isolated manuscripts, the Vulgate Form appears in at least ten codices. The reason for the relatively wide distribution of the Vulgate Form lies in the fact that it was included in the *Collection in Five Books*, which the Roman law expert, Carlo Guido Mor, forty years ago dubbed as the vade-mecum of central and southern Italian canonists of the eleventh and twelfth centuries.<sup>36</sup> The *Collection in Five Books* is, indeed, a canon law collection, and hence it is understandable that the correspondence of Damasus and Jerome dealing with a Nicene decision should be included if only for the sake of canonistic completeness. But the *Collection in Five Books* is more than a canon law collection. It is one of the richest patristic and liturgical florilegia of the early Middle Ages—a fact generally overlooked by patristic, canon law, and liturgical scholars alike. Hence, it was also appropriate that a correspondence attributed to two of the great fathers of the Western Church, together with liturgical Mass commentary, be included in a florilegium of this type.

Whether or not the *Collection in Five Books* was the vade-mecum for Italian canonists of the eleventh and early twelfth centuries, as Mor said it was, is somewhat problematical (as any scholar will attest who has lugged one of the heavy folio-sized volumes from desk to desk at the Vatican, Vallicelliana, and Monte Cassino libraries). Rather, the collection seems to have been a vast and well-ordered reference tool in such monastic libraries as Monte Cassino, Sant'Eutizio in Val Castoriana, and perhaps Narni and Farfa.<sup>37</sup> Nonetheless, manuscripts of the derivatives of the *Collection in Five Books* are indeed of vade-mecum or at least saddlebag size and were scattered throughout central and southern Italy and even Catalonia. The reason for the inclusion of our text in these derivative collections lies probably in the fact that, within the *Collection in Five Books* itself, it was the first text in the section devoted to the subject of the Mass<sup>38</sup> and thus served as an introduction or interpretative preface to subsequent canons dealing with the objects, persons, and elements of the eucharistic liturgy. Further, it is not surprising to find our text included in such liturgical florilegia as that of the Farfese *Multi-loquiorum* of the manuscript V6 or the Tortosa codex, given the attempt in these manuscripts to collect a number of liturgical commentaries.

<sup>36</sup> 'La reazione al *Decretum Burchardi* in Italia avanti la riforma gregoriana', *Studi gregoriani* 1 (1947) 201.

<sup>37</sup> Theo Kölzer, *Collectio canonum Regesto Farfensi inserta* (Monumenta iuris canonici, Ser. B, Corpus collectionum 5; Vatican City, 1982), pp. 48-55, has argued that a copy of the collection served as the source of his collection in the Farfa Register.

<sup>38</sup> In the collection the title of our text in 3.212 (Fornasari, *Collectio*, p. 413) serves as the divisional rubric for the subsequent canons on the Mass.

## XI

## ABBREVIATED VULGATE FORM

Although the manuscript errors of this form in manuscript V7 are often like those in the Extended Penitential Form in the *Collection in Nine Books*, compiled perhaps in the tenth century, the Abbreviated Vulgate Form [Text 11] is clearly based on the Vulgate Form. It contains the question 'Ergo quid prodest illum sacrificium?' and in an abbreviated fashion the trinitarian significance of *sa-cer-dos* and *pres-bi-ter*.<sup>39</sup> Moreover, the abbreviations in the earlier witness, V7, are both more and less extensive than in the later manuscript, NY, which shows that there were at least two versions of the abbreviation in circulation.

V7 is highly significant for the date and location of the Mass commentary and the Vulgate Form. The manuscript itself was written in Rome perhaps as early as A.D. 1000;<sup>40</sup> this shows that the Vulgate Form of our commentary was in circulation and had been abbreviated probably even before the compilation sometime between 1014 and c. 1025 of the *Collection in Five Books*. Further, although written in normal minuscule and 'romanesca', there are numerous Beneventan-script symptoms, even to the typical interrogation marks in the question 'Ergo quid prodest illum sacrificium?', which suggests a south Italian model.<sup>41</sup> Finally, the Bedan martyrology in the codex has additions of a Beneventan type.<sup>42</sup>

The other codex of the Abbreviated Vulgate Form, NY, although from a house of canons regular at Santa Maria del Estany southwest of Vic in Catalonia, is also closely related to a south Italian tradition and to the Roman codex V7.<sup>43</sup> Our Mass commentary here follows a text on the origins of Septuagesima that appears elsewhere in a Beneventan-script codex.<sup>44</sup> Following the commentary are texts similar to those found in the *Collection in Five Books*, but resembling more closely those in V7. Several liturgico-canonical pieces subsequent to our commentary are related to texts circulating in eleventh-century Roman manuscripts with Beneventan-script connections.<sup>45</sup>

\*  
\* \*

<sup>39</sup> In the codex V7 the scribe presented the explanation of *sa-cer-dos*, wrote *Pater*, and then left a blank on the page of a size necessary to write the explanation for *pres-bi-ter*. NY lacks completely the explanation for *pres-bi-ter*.

<sup>40</sup> Supino Martini, *Roma e l'area*, p. 74.

<sup>41</sup> Reynolds, 'South Italian *Liturgica*', 485 n. 24.

<sup>42</sup> Henri Quentin, *Les martyrologes historiques du moyen âge. Étude sur la formation du martyrologe romain* (Paris, 1908), pp. 39-42.

<sup>43</sup> Reynolds, 'South Italian *Liturgica*', 480.

<sup>44</sup> Thomas Forrest Kelly and Herman F. Holbrook, 'Beneventan Fragments at Altamura', *Mediaeval Studies* 49 (1987) 466-71.

<sup>45</sup> Reynolds, 'South Italian *Liturgica*', 483-92; to which should now be added the observations of Supino Martini, *Roma e l'area*, pp. 88-98, 122.

All the forms of the correspondence between Damasus and Jerome and the appended Mass commentary appear in manuscripts written from the turn of the millennium to the early twelfth century. Then the text seems to have fallen out of favor. In the dates and origins of the codices there is a possible explanation for the rise and decline in popularity of the text; it is precisely this period in which the *Collection in Five Books*, its sources, and derivatives were widely copied and circulated.<sup>46</sup> Beginning in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries, however, developments in the areas of canon law, liturgy, and theological study were taking place that would render our text obsolete. In canon law Gratian's *Decretum* would make prior collections such as the *Collection in Five Books* and its derivatives largely out of date. In the area of liturgical commentary a new style came into vogue, epitomized in the *Micrologus* of Bernold of Constance, in which the florid but questionable explanations of the liturgy found in our text were downplayed and attempts were made at a more sober, historical analysis.<sup>47</sup> Finally, in the area of sacramental theology there came into being in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries the new type of florilegium, the sentence collection, drawing together patristic and early medieval texts on liturgical matters under intense debate at that time: the reality of Christ's presence in the bread and wine, the sacramental character of the various liturgical rites of the Church, and so forth. Because of the questionable authenticity of our correspondence between Damasus and Jerome with its reference to a dubious Nicene decision, and because of the fantasy of the Mass commentary, it is no wonder that our text had fallen out of favor by the mid-twelfth century, and indeed no wonder that modern canonistic and liturgical historians have paid scant attention to it since. Nonetheless, in its exuberance, color, and imagination the correspondence and commentary attributed to Pope Damasus and St. Jerome affords us a precious insight into the spiritual and allegorical understanding of elements in the eucharistic liturgy of the early Middle Ages.

## XII

### TEXTS

Several conventions have governed the presentation of the edition of the eleven recensions of the Mass commentary below. The manuscripts do not often exhibit the texts as divided into paragraphs or parts, so an effort has been made to illustrate the evolution and growth of the text by isolating the correspondence itself between Damasus and Jerome and by placing the salutations and titles in small capitals. The

<sup>46</sup> For a list of manuscripts and fragments see Roger E. Reynolds, 'Law, Canon: to Gratian' in *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* 7.408-10.

<sup>47</sup> See Reynolds, 'Liturgy, Treatises on' in *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* 7.624-33.

fanciful commentary on the Mass following the correspondence has been divided into paragraphs so as to emphasize the development and structure of the sometimes obscure text.

For individual recensions, the text of the oldest surviving witness has generally been followed. The orthographic peculiarities of that witness have been preserved, although in some cases angle brackets indicate editorial additions. It is important to emphasize here that grammatical and syntactical errors and occasionally gibberish have been retained in the texts because these readings were often incorporated into later versions and thus can provide useful evidence regarding textual transmission. Purely orthographical variants are usually not reported. Modern conventions of punctuation and capitalization have been employed in place of the highly erratic punctuation and capitalization in the manuscripts. Textual variants are reported according to chronological sequence.

Further information is given at the beginning of each text for peculiar problems. Manuscripts containing each text are listed together with date and origin or provenance when known.

### 1. *Short Correspondence Form with Brief Conclusion*

This version is found in the following manuscripts:

- S = Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek HB VI 113 (s. viii/ix, Chur), fol. 103v
- G = St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek 446 (s. ix<sup>2</sup>/3, St. Gall), p. 204
- Pr = Prague, Státní knihovna ČSR Teplá 1 (c. 828-876, vicinity of Regensburg; prov. Kloster Oberaltaich), pp. 204-205
- B = Bamberg, Staatliche Bibliothek Lit. 131 (A.II.53) (s. x), fol. 76r-v
- L = London, British Library Add. 16413 (s. xi, south Italy), fols. 6v-7r
- V1 = Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Vat. lat. 1146 (s. xi, central Italy), fol. 34r
- W = Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek 914 (s. xi), fols. 32v-33r
- M = Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 14581 (s. xi/xii, St. Emmeram), fols. 77v-78r
- V2 = Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Vat. lat. 1147 (s. xi/xii, central Italy), fol. 36v
- V3 = Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Vat. lat. 1148 (s. xii, central Italy), fol. 35r.

The text printed here is based on G because the text in S, the oldest witness, contains a number of corruptions and lacks the important *non* in l. 10. The text of G has been collated with S, Pr, B, L, V1, W, M, and V2. Grammatical and syntactical errors such as *qualis* (l. 3) and *alias ... has* (l. 10) have been preserved.

As for the relationships of the manuscripts, it appears that G and S derive from a common form and that B is related to G. The text of L, written in Beneventan script, clearly reflects a south Italian tradition. V1 and V2, both from central Italy, are clearly related, although V2, like the related Pr and W, has omitted several words in ll. 8 f. M shares readings with V1 and V2, as well as with L.

The correspondence of Damasus and Jerome, together with c. 24 of Theodulf of Orléans' *Capitula* 1 (MGH *Leges, Capitula episcoporum* 1.121), has been entered by an early ninth-century hand on a blank folio of S. It is perhaps significant that the correspondence and Theodulf's *Capitula* also appear in the central Italian V1.

#### INQUISITIO BEATI DAMASI PAPE URBIS ROMAE A HIERONIMO PRESBITERO

Frater et conpresbiter noster Hieronimae, quid tibi videtur de die sancto dominico qualiter sollemnia missarum agere debemus, aut de aliis diebus qualis horis est licitum celebrare?

5

#### RESPONDIT HIERONIMUS

Domine et dulcissime pater, tibi veritas minime est absconsa. Synodo Niceni concilii, cum ccc x et viii patres, qualiter apud ipsos est inventum quod in die dominico nullus post horam diei terciam sollemnia missarum agere presumat, et denuntiaverunt quod qui presumat anathema sit; et aliis vero diebus v vi vii viii hora  
10 non celebrentur sollemnia missarum; alias vero has licitum est.

Papa dixit, Rectum est quod dixisti.

---

1 Ieronimo Presbitero ante Inquisitio ... Rome W Ad Hieronimum L V1 M (Ab Hieronimo corr. V1) Urbis Romae om. Pr Presbiterum V1 M (Presbitero corr. V1) 2 Fratri L conpresbiter Pr noster conpresbiter S: conpresbitero nostro L Hieronimo L Pr quid] quod B W 3 qualiter] qua hora L missarum sollempnis L de om. L qualis] quibus L M: qualibus V1 V2 W 4 lititum Pr 5 Responsio V1 M V2 W 6 Domne Pr et om. L dulcissime] sanctissime L est om. B Synodo om. L: Sinado S 7 ccc xx et viii Pr patribus L apud] aput S: ab L ipsis L quod in] ut L 8 tertiam oram diei L 8-9 et ... presumat om. V2 W 9 quod ... sit] ut qui presumpserit anathematizetur L et] de add. L: om. L diebus om. Pr 10 non om. S celebretur L sollempnitas L aliis L M V1 V2 W has] horis L M V1 V2 W lititum Pr 11 Papa] Damasus add. L quod] ut L

## 2. Short Correspondence Form With Long Conclusion

This form appears in the following manuscripts:

MC1 = Monte Cassino, Archivio della Badia 384 (s. x, south Italy), p. 135

C = Cava dei Tirreni, Biblioteca del Monumento Nazionale dell'Abbazia della SS. Trinità 3 (s. xi, south Italy), fol. 313r-v

Ma1 = Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional 19 (s. xii), fol. 157r

P1 = Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 7418 (s. xiii/xiv, Italy), fols. 205v-206r.

The text printed here is based on its oldest witness, MC1, which is written in Beneventan script. The following spelling, grammatical, and syntactical errors have been retained: *diem sanctam dominicam quam* (ll. 2-3), *consilii* (l. 6), *Damasius* (l. 11), *tue terris* (l. 12), and *homi* (l. 12). The corruption *tue terris* of l. 12 instead of *tuearis* suggests scribal misunderstanding of the exemplar. C is written in Beneventan script; Ma1 contains Beneventan interrogation signs and has material related to the south Italian canonical *Collection in Five Books*.

Because of its title the text of MC1 appears to be related to the Short Correspondence Form with Brief Conclusion in the Beneventan-script codex L.

### INQUISITIO DAMASII PAPE AD HIERONIMUM PRESBITERUM

Fratri et conpresbitero nostro Hieronimo. Quid tibi videtur de diem sanctam dominicam quam hora missarum sollemnia agere debemus, aut aliis diebus quibus horis licitum est celebrare?

5

### RESPONDET HIERONIMUS

Domine sanctissime pater, tibi veritas minime est absconsa. Niceni consilii ccc x et viii patres qualiter et ab ipsis est institutum ut die dominica nullus post tertiam horam missarum sollemnia agere presumat, et denuntiaverunt ut qui presumpserit,

---

1 Inquisitio] Epistola C: Epistula Ma1 P1    Damasi C Ma1 P1    Presbiterum om. C Ma1 P1:  
De die dominica qua hora celebratur add. P1    2 Damasus papa ante Fratri C Ma1 P1    die  
C Ma1 P1    sancta C Ma1 P1    3 dominica C Ma1 P1    qua C Ma1 P1    sollemnia C Ma1  
P1    quibus] qui C    4 est licitum C Ma1 P1    5 Hieronimus respondit C: Hieronimus  
respondet Ma1 P1    6 consilii] concilii recordare ubi C Ma1 P1    7 qualiter] adunati fuerunt add.  
C Ma1 P1    tertiam] ausus esset add. C Ma1 P1    8 horam om. C Ma1 P1    sollemnia Ma1  
P1    presumat om. C Ma1 P1    presumpserit] presumpserit C Ma1 P1



anathematizetur; et de aliis diebus v et vi vii viii hora non celebretur sollemnitas  
10 missarum; aliis vero horis licitum est.

Papa Damasius, Rectum est quod dixisti; dextera tua erigat, virtute confirmet,  
potestate tue terris aecclesie tue sanctisque altaribus cum homi desiderata prosperi-  
tate restituas. Amen.

---

9 et<sup>2</sup> om. *C Mal Pl* viii om. *C Mal Pl* 9-10 missarum sollempnitas *C Mal Pl*  
11 Damasius] Damasus dixit *C Mal Pl* erigas *C Mal Pl* confirmes *C Mal Pl* 12 tue  
terris] tuearis *C Mal Pl* homi] omni *C Mal Pl* desiderata om. *C Mal Pl* 13 Amen om.  
*C Mal Pl*

### 3. Long Correspondence Form with Short Conclusion

This form is in P2 (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 9631 [s. XII], fol. 46r). Its conclusion demonstrates that this text is related to the Short Correspondence Form with Brief Conclusion. On the same folio containing our commentary there are canons regarding the number of celebrants in the Mass that are attributed to Pope Leo ('Auctoritate apostolica interdicimus ut nullus presbiterorum missas solus celebrare presumat nisi cum duobus aut tribus clericis ...') and to Pope Sother ('Statutum est ut nullus presbiterorum missarum sollempnia celebrare presumat nisi duobus presentibus sibi que respondentibus ut ipse tercius habeatur ...'). This latter text is appended to the Tortosa Form (Text 7 below).

#### INTERROGATIO DAMASI PAPE

Frater et conpresbiter noster Iheronime, quid tibi videtur de die dominica et de aliis diebus quibus et qualibus horis licitum est missarum sollempnia agere et celebrare?

5

#### RESPONSIO IHERONIMI

Domino nostro beatissimo et sacratissimo pape Damaso Iheronimus. Tibi veritas minime est absconsa, et synodus Niceni concilii quomodo et qualiter apud illos cccxviii patres est inventum ut nullus in dominico die post horam terciam ipsius diei presumat missam celebrare secundum institutionem canonicam, et qui  
10 presumit, anathema sit; et aliis diebus hora v et vi et vii non est licitum missam celebrare secundum institutionem canonicam; et aliis horis in cotidianis diebus

licitum est missam celebrare iuxta canones, hoc est, mane hora i et ii et iii et iiiii et post meridiem hora viii et viiii et x et xi et xii.

Beatus Damasus dixit, Rectum est quod dicis et omnibus nobis placet.

#### 4. *Long Correspondence Form with Long Conclusion*

This form is printed from Wo (Wolfenbüttel, Herzog-August-Bibliothek Cod. Guelf. 69 Weissenburg [s. x/xi, prov. Weissenburg]), in which the text is entered perhaps as a *probatio pennae* on fol. 1r. The manuscript contains the works of Paulinus of Aquileia and the *Vita* and *Regula* of Pachomius. Like P2, the text here is related to the Short Correspondence Form with Brief Conclusion in S, G, and Pr. The misspelling of *Nicaemi* (l. 5) has been preserved.

#### INTERROGATIO DAMASI PAPAE DE MISSARUM CELEBRATIONE

Frater et prespiter noster Hieronimus, quid tibi videtur de die dominico, et de aliis diebus quibus et qualibus horis licitum est missarum sollemnia celebrare?

#### RESPONDIT HIERONIMUS

- 5 Tibi domine papae veritas minime absconsa est. Et quomodo sinodus Nicaemi concilii, quomodo et qualiter apud ccc x et viii patrum inventum est, ut nullus in dominico die post horam tertiam ipsius diei presumat missam celebrare. Et qui presumpserit, anathema sit a Deo et hominibus; et aliis festis diebus hora v vi et vii non est licitum missam celebrare secundum canones, et ceteris horis in  
10 cotidianis etiam diebus licitum est missam celebrare mane hora i ii iii iiiii v vi vii viii viiii x xi et xii in nomine Dei summi et in honorem sancte Mariae, et similiter omnium qui in caelis sunt et in terra. AMEN.

#### 5. *Short Penitential Form*

This form is found in the following manuscripts:

P3 = Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 3187 (s. xii), fols. 131v-132v

Ta = Tarragona, Biblioteca Provincial 26 (s. xii, Catalonia), fol. 224r.

The text here is printed from P3, and the misspelled *Misce* (l. 1), *qorum* (l. 18), and *missa* (l. 20) have been preserved. It is noteworthy that in Ta a very extensive

part of the text has been omitted, including the last part of Jerome's reply and the beginning of the explanation after the reply had been received in Rome.

P3 also contains the canonical *Collection in Four Parts*, the last of whose canons ends on fol. 121v. Another hand continues on fol. 123r with various texts. Our Mass exposition bears the number 'lxxii' in P3, which suggests that it may have been drawn from a canonical collection; following the exposition is the celebrated canon, noted as 'lxxiii', attributed to Pope Gregory VII<sup>48</sup> on the office, the same canon which precedes the Mass exposition in Ta.

Ta, the so-called *Pontifical of San Ramón*, is a liturgico-canonical manuscript containing the canonical *Liber Tarraconensis* and a variety of liturgical pieces.<sup>49</sup> A different hand has entered our Mass commentary at the end of the Gregorian canon.

#### EPISTULA DAMASII PAPE AD HIERONIMUM PRESBITERUM DE ORA MISCE LXXII

Cum quadam diae resideret sanctissimus papa Damasus in sede beati Petri apostoli, intentio orta est in tota aecclesia Romana de sacrificio qua hora licet sacrificium sacerdoti offerre, et non inveniebant. Tunc transmisit aepistulam suam  
5 ad beatum Hieronimum presbiterum Hierosolimis ita.

#### DAMASUS PAPA HIERONIMO PRESBITERO IN DOMINO AETERNAM SALUTEM

Dirigimus vestrae fraternitati quia intentio orta est in tota aecclesia Romana de sacrificio qua hora licet sacrificare et non invenimus et inde finem. Dirigat nobis sanctitas vestra vos quia omnia scrutamini quomodo exinde agamus.

10

#### HIERONIME

Pater sanctissime, veritas nobis minime est absconsa. Recordare concilii Niceni in quo ccc decem et octo patres sancti congregati fuerunt. Constitutum est enim

---

1 Ad Hieronimum ... lxxii om. Ta    2 residet Damasus sanctissimus papa Ta    5 presbiterum om. Ta    6 in Domino post salutem Ta    7 fraternitate Ta    8 nobis om. Ta    11 vobis Ta  
12 in quo om. Ta

<sup>48</sup> On this text see Ch. Dereine, 'La prétendue règle de Grégoire VII pour chanoines réguliers', *Revue bénédictine* 71 (1961) 111.

<sup>49</sup> Reynolds, 'South Italian *Liturgica*', 484.

ab eis quod siquis diae dominicae resurrectionis post horam tertiam ausus fuerit  
canere missam, anathematizetur; aliis vero diebus a tertia usque ad horam nonam,  
15 similiter anathematizatur; aliis vero horis licitum est sacrificare.

Cumque fuisset relecta aepistula, invenerunt in concilio scriptum a ccc decem et  
octo patribus sanctis qui inflammati fuerunt de Spiritu Sancto quomodo in Nicea  
qoram Constantino magnifico et catholico ac sanctissimo imperatorae scripserunt  
et constituerunt: siquis die dominico sacrificare ausus fuerit post horam tertiam aut  
20 ausus fuerit canere missa, in dampnatione eius sit et anathematizatur.

Pro eo quod Spiritus Sanctus hora tertia descendit ad apostolos, ideo non est  
licitum post horam tertiam die dominico nec sacrificare nec ieiunare nec ullam  
abstinentiam habere. Siquis pro neglectu ieiunaverit, vii dies peniteat in pane et  
aqua. De aliis vero diebus a media hora tertia usque in horam nonam, similiter  
25 anathematizetur pro eo quod ista hora Christus in passione in patibulo crucis stetit  
pro nostra salute.

Et ipsa sacrificia quando sacri<fi>caverit sacerdos, non presuma<t> solus  
sacrificare quia Christus quando sacrificium pro totius mundi salute se immolare  
permisit, duo latrones in cruce fuerunt cum eo.

---

13 dominica die Ta 13-19 resurrectionis ... siquis die dominico om. Ta 19 aut] aud Ta  
20 fuerit om. Ta missas Ta 23 abstenenciam Ta 24 in] mediam add. Ta  
27 sacrificaverit Ta presumat Ta 28 sacrificaverit Ta imolare Ta

## 6. Intermediate Penitential Form

This form is found in Va1 (Rome, Biblioteca Vallicelliana B 66, fols. 75v-78r [s. xi, south Italy]). The following grammatical and syntactical errors have been preserved: *patres sancti* (ll. 12, 16), *missa* (ll. 13, 19), *Alii* (l. 23), *amictu* (l. 40), and *illud odorem* (l. 49). Fols. 89-152 of the codex were copied in the twelfth century and bear the ex-libris of S. Bartolomeo di Trisulti.<sup>50</sup>

### ÆPISTULA IERONIMI PRESBITERI DE SACRIFICIO

Dum resideret sanctissimus papa Damasus in sede beati Petri apostoli, intentio orta  
est in ecclesia Romana de sacrificio qua hora sacerdoti licet offerre, et non

<sup>50</sup> On the Beneventan-script codices from S. Bartolomeo di Trisulti, see Roger E. Reynolds, 'Odilo and the *Treuga Dei* in Southern Italy: A Beneventan Manuscript Fragment', *Mediaeval Studies* 46 (1984) 453 n. 16.

inveniebat exinde finem. Tunc misit aepistulam ad beatum Ieronimum Ierusalimis  
5 ita.

## DAMASUS PAPA IERONIMO IN DOMINO SALUTEM

Dirigimus vestrae fraternitatis quia intentio orta est in Romana aecclesia de  
sacrificio qua hora sacerdos sacrificaret et non inveniemus exinde finem. Dirigat  
nobis sanctitas vestra quomodo inde exigamus.

10

IERONIMUS

Pater in Domino sanctissime, veritas tibi minime est absconsa. Recordare  
concilium Niceni ubi a cccx et viii patres sancti affixum et constitutum est, siquis  
sacerdos die dominico supra tertia hora presumpserit missa canere, anathemati-  
zetur: aliis vero diebus si a tertia et usque in nonam praesumpserit, similiter  
15 anathematizetur; aliis vero horis licitum est sacrificare.

Cumque lecta fuisset epistula, invenerunt in concilio scriptum a cccxviii patres qui  
inflammati fuerunt de Spiritu Sancto, qualiter in Nicenam coram Constantino  
magnifico et catholico ac sanctissimo imperatore scripserunt et constituerunt,  
siquis sacerdos die dominico supra hora tertia presumpserit missa canere, anathe-  
20 matizetur.

Pro eo quod Spiritus Sanctus hora tertia descendit ad apostolos, ideo non est  
licitum post horam tertiam die dominico nec sacrificare nec ieiunare. Siquis per  
neglegentiam ieiunaverit, vii dies poeniteat in pane et aqua. Alii vero diebus a  
media hora iiii usque in media hora viii qui sacrificaverit, similiter anathematizetur,  
25 pro eo quia in ista hora Christus in patibulo crucis stetit pro nostra salute.

Et quando sacrificaverit sacerdos, non praesumat sacrificare solus quia Christus  
quando sacrificium pro totius mundi saluta immolari se permisit, duo latrones  
immolati sunt cum eo. Ergo si solum sacrificaverit, cui dicit, Dominus vobiscum?  
Melius est illi dicere, Dominus mecum et cum spiritu meo. Ecce satis blasphematur  
30 si duo vel tres non habet ministros. Et si hoc habet, sana fide potest dicere  
Dominus vobiscum et illi respondentes, Et sic nobis optasti ut Deus esset  
nobiscum, et nos optamus ut sit Dominus cum spiritu tuo. Et si solus sacrificaverit,  
videtur esse Pater solus nec Filium nec Spiritum Sanctum in Trinitate esse. Si cum  
ministro uno sacrificaverit, ergo dicit, Dominus tecum. Ab illo sit longe. Si cum

---

27 latrones] nomina latronum, Aspalorga et alio Alaban *in marg. Val*

35 duobus ministris sacrificat, videtur in eo esse perfecta Trinitas. Et aliter, ergo cum sacrificat habeat secum duos ministros. Sic Salvator in evangelio dicit, Ubi duo vel tres congregati fuerint in nomine meo in medio eorum sum (Mt 18:20). Et in alio loco, tres testimonia apud Deum firmata sunt (1 Jo 5:7-8?). Et si plus fuerint melius sunt apud Deum et homines.

40 Et habeat secum sacerdos quando sacrificat linea et cingulum et amictu et orarium et planeta, et in manu teneat mappulam et sudarium et trilicem in honore sancte Trinitatis propter sacrificium ponenda super altare.

Et in nullo permittimus sine lumine sacrificare quia qui sine lumine sacrificat videtur esse sacrificium cecum. Absit! Non permittat Deus ut hoc fiat sacrificium  
45 a Christianis quia si lumen accensum habet perfecta Trinitas ibi videtur habere virtutem quia oleum aut cera et papirum et flamma Trinitatem significant.

Et habeat incensum sacerdos quia angeli Satane quando ceciderunt de caelo in terram in fetore ceciderunt. Cum autem odorem incensi facit sacerdos ad altare, mox fugit diabolus et illud odorem incensi ante Deum ascendit, et incensum et  
50 odorem et ignem Trinitatem significat.

Et quando offerens Deo in altare, si solum panem ponit videtur Pater non habere Filium, et si panem et vinum ponit videtur esse Pater cum Filio non habere Spiritum Sanctum. Si panem et vinum et aquam adunatim, videtur esse Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum.

### 7. *Tortosa Form*

This form is found in To (Tortosa, Biblioteca Capitular 122 [s. x/xi, south Italy; s. xii, Catalonia], fols. 42v-43v) and is printed here with the puzzling abbreviation for Mt 18:20 (l. 39), probably denoting something like 'congregati fuerint in nomine (*sic*) meo i. (*sic*) sum in medio.' Errors such as *toto* (l. 3) have been preserved.

### DE HORA SACRIFICANDI

Cum quadam die resideret sanctissimus papa Damasus in sede beati Petri apostoli, intentio orta est in toto ecclesia Romana de sacrificio qua hora debet et liceret offerre, et non inveniebatur. Tunc transmisit epistolam suam ad beatum Iheronim  
5 mum presbiterum Iherusolimis ita dicendo.

## DAMASUS PAPA IERONIMO PRESBITERO IN DOMINO ETERNAM SALUTEM

Dirigimus sanctitati atque fraternitati vestre quia intentio orta est in tota ecclesia Romana de sacrificio qua hora licet offerre et non invenimus eundem finem. Dirigat nobis sanctitas vestra vos qui omnia scrutamini quomodo exinde agamus.

10

IHERONIMUS

Pater sanctissime, veritas vobis minime est absconsa. Recordare concilium Nicenum ubi a trecentis decem et octo patribus affixum et constitutum est ut siquis die dominico post horam terciam ausus fuerit missam canere, anathematizetur; aliis vero diebus a tertia usque ad horam nonam si praesumpserit, similiter anathematizetur.

Cumque perlecta fuisset epistula, invenerunt in concilio scriptum a trecentis decem et octo patribus sanctis qui imbuti erant Spiritu Sancto quod in Nicea coram sancto Constantino magnifico et catholico viro ac sanctissimo imperatore scripserunt et constituerunt ut siquis die dominico post horam terciam ausus fuerit missam canere, in dampnatione anathematizetur.

Pro eo quod Spiritus Sanctus hora tertia descendit ad apostolos, ideoque non licet post horam terciam die dominico sacrificare nec ieiunare nec ullam abstinenciam habere. De aliis vero diebus a media hora tertia usque in mediam horam octavam, qui hoc praesumpserit anathemate feriat pro eo quod in istas horas Christus in passione et in patibulo crucis stetit pro nostra salute. Ideoque si in istas horas praesumpserit sacerdos sacrificare, angeli non suscipiunt sacrificium ad offerendum maiestati.

Ipsa vero sacrificia quando sacerdos sacrificat, non praesumat solus sacrificare quia Christus quando sacrificium pro totius mundi salute immolari se permisit, duo latrones cum eo in cruce fuerunt. Si ergo solus sacrificaverit sacerdos, cui dicit, Dominus vobiscum? Certe melius est dicere, Dominus mecum et ipse respondeat, Et cum spiritu meo. Si duo autem tres habet ministros, sana fide dicere potest, Dominus vobiscum et illi respondeant, Sicut tu nobis optasti vero Deus esset nobiscum, et nos similiter optamus ut sit Dominus cum spiritu tuo. Si solus et enim sacrificat, videtur Pater esse solus sine Filio et Spiritu sancto. Si autem cum uno ministro sacrificaverit, cui detur, Dominus vobiscum? Melius est ergo dicere, Dominus tecum aut nobiscum. At si cum duobus ministris sacrificaverit, videtur esse perfecta Trinitas. Ergo qui sacrificat habeat secum duos ministros sicut dicit in evangelio, Ubi duo vel tres c. f. i. m. i. s. i. m. eorum (Mt 18:20).

- 40 Sacerdos vero habeat quando sac<ri>ficat amictum, camisum, cingulum, manipulum, stolam, planetam, corporalem triplicem in honore Trinitatis ad sacrificandum septem dona Spiritus Sancti.

- In nullo permittimus sine lumine sacrificare quia qui sine lumine sacrificaverit videtur illum esse cecum sacrificium quia absit ut fiat sacrificium cecum apud  
45 Christianos, quia si lumen accensum habet, perfecta Trinitas ibi videtur habere virtutem quia in oleo sive cera et papiro et flamma Trinitas significatur.

- E contra sententia sancte Trinitatis quia lumen pro vice Christi ponitur. Omnis sacerdos quando sacrificat lumen habeat quia ipse dixit, Ego sum lux mundi (Jo 8:12). Habeat ergo incensum quia angeli quando de celo ceciderunt in terram cum  
50 fetore ceciderunt. Cum vero sacerdos incensum facit ad altare, praesentialiter fugit diabolus et ille odor per angelos ante Deum accenditur, et per incensum et odorem et ignem Trinitas significatur.

- Quando autem sacerdos offert Domino sacrificium, id est panem et vinum et aquam, ibi adesse debent quia si solum panem ponit, videtur Pater non habere  
55 Filium. Si panem et vinum, videtur Pater esse cum Filio sed non habere Spiritum Sanctum. Sed si panem et vinum et aquam intersunt, videtur Pater esse cum Filio et Spiritu Sancto.

- Inde est enim quod dicimus, Sanctus Sanctus Sanctus tribus vicibus ad honorem individue Trinitatis. Et si solum ignem habeat ad sacrificandum, videtur etiam Pater  
60 non habere Filium nec Spiritum Sanctum quia in lumine tria sunt, cera papyrus et ignis, per quos Trinitas intelligi quod etiam et presbiter: per cera Pater, per papirum Filium, per ignem Spiritum Sanctum.

- Sacerdos et enim T<ri>nitatem eandem interpretatur: Pater sa-, Filius cer-, Spiritus Sanctus -dos. Unde sacerdos Trinitas intelligitur quod etiam et presbiter:  
65 Pater pres-, Filius bi-, Spiritus Sanctus -ter. Ecce sacerdos et presbiter Trinitas intelligi potest.

Similiter etiam corporale triplici positum in altari eodem modo Trinitas figuratur.

Tribus etiam vicibus Agnus Dei propter sanctam Trinitatem figurative dicimus.

- Quicumque sacerdotum quam ut supradiximus praesumptionem aliter sacrificare  
70 praesumpserit, nec sibi lumen nec aliis lucem praestat sicut alibi legitur in eva<n>gelium, Si cecus cecum duxerit nonne ambo in foveam cadunt? (Mt 15:14, Lc 6:39)

- Unusquisque presbiter hostiam sanctam et immaculatam Domino offerre licet absque sorde semper debet et cum magno timore coram Deo humiliter custodire  
75 ut non ipsius negligentia quoquomodo maculetur. Hoc quoque ut a sanctis patribus



constitutum est, Nullus illorum missarum sollempnia solus celebrare praesumat nisi duobus sibiue respondentibus, id est tercius habeatur quia pluraliter ab eo dicitur in secretis, Orate pro me fratres ut meum ac vestrum sacrificium acceptum sit omnipotenti Deo.

---

76-79 Nullus illorum ... omnipotenti Deo: cf. Burchardum, *Decretum* 3.74 (PL 140.689) et Gratianum, *De consec.* 1.61 et fontesque eius (Friedberg 1.1311).

### 8. *Neapolitan Penitential Form*

This form is found in N1 (Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, Vindob. lat. 23 [s. XII, central Italy], fol. 94v). In the text printed below the following incorrect spellings and grammatical and syntactical errors have been preserved even though many of these have been corrected in the manuscript: *toto* (l. 7), *concili* (l. 11), *patres* (l. 17), *solum* (ll. 27, 29), *mappula* (l. 42), *trilice* (l. 42), *paperunt* (l. 47), *poni* (l. 55), *sorte* (l. 61), *Trinitate* (l. 66). N1, which has Beneventan-script symptoms, has an ex-libris on fol. 3v: 'Liber monachorum congregationis S. Iustine de padua deputatus monasterio S. Severini de Neapoli signatus numero 26'.

### EPISTULA DAMASI AD IERONIMUM PRESBITERUM

Dum quadam die resideret sanctissimus papa Damasus in sede beati Petri apostoli, intentio orta est in tota ecclesia Romana de sacrificiis qua hora licet sacrificium sacerdoti offerre, et non inveniebant. Tunc transmisit epistulam suam ad beatum  
5 Hieronimum presbiterum Hierosolimis ita.

### DAMASUS PAPA HIERONIMO PRESBITERO IN DOMINO AETERNAM SALUTEM

Dirigimus vestrae fraternitati quia intencio nunc orta est in toto ecclesia Romana de sacrificio qua hora licet sacrificare et non invenimus exinde finem. Dirigat nobis sanctitas vestra vos qui omnia scrutatis quomodo exinde exigamus.

---

6 Damasus ... salutem *in marg. N1* , 9 scrutatis *ex scrutamini corr. N1*

10

## HIERONIME

Pater sanctissime, veritas vobis minime est absconsa. Recordare concili Niceni ubi ccc decem et viii patres sancti erant, et affixum et constitutum est ab eis: siquis die dominico resurrectionis super hora tertia ausus fuerit canere missam, anathematizetur; aliis diebus a quarta usque in horam nonam, similiter anathematizetur;

15 aliis vero horis licitum est sacrificare.

Cum relecta fuisset epistula, invenerunt in concilio scriptum a ccc decem et viii patres sanctis qui inflammati fuerunt de Spiritu Sancto, quomodo in Nicea coram Constantino magnifico et catholico ac sanctissimo imperatore scripserunt et constituerunt, siquis dominico die super horam tertiam ausus fuerit canere missam,

20 in dampnatione anathematizetur.

Pro eo quod Spiritus Sanctus ora tertia descendit ad apostolos, ideo non est licitum post horam tertiam die dominico nec sacrificare nec ieiunare nec ullam abstinentiam habere. Siquis per neglectum ieiunaverit, vii dies peniteat in pane et aqua. De aliis vero diebus a media hora quarta usque in mediam horam nonam, similiter

25 anathematizetur pro eo quod istas horas Christus in patibulo crucis stetit pro nostra salute.

Et ipsa sacrificia quando sacrificaverit sacerdos, non presumat solum sacrificare quia Christus quando sacrificium pro totius mundi salute se immolari permisit, duos latrones in cruce fuerunt cum ipso. Ergo si solum sacrificaverit, cui dicet,

30 Dominus vobiscum? Melius est illi dicere, Dominus mecum et cum spiritu meo. Ecce satis blasphematur si duos vel tres non habet ministros. Et si hoc habet, sana fide potest dicere, Dominus vobiscum. Illi ei respondentes dicant, Et tu sicut nobis obtasti ut Deus esset nobiscum, et nos obtamus ut sit Dominus cum spiritu tuo.

Quia si solus sacrificat videtur esse Pater solus, Filium nec Spiritum Sanctum in

35 Trinitate esse. Si cum ministro uno sacrificat, ergo dicit, Dominus tecum. Absit. Si cum duobus ministris sacrificat, videtur esse in eo perfecta Trinitas. Et aliter, ergo cum sacrificat habeat secum duos ministros, sicut evangelium dicit, Ubi duo vel tres steterint in nomine meo in medio eorum sum (Mt 18:20). Et in omni loco tria testimonia apud Deum firmata sunt (1 Jo 5:7-8?). Et si plus sunt, ecce quam

40 melius sunt apud Deum et hominem.

Et habeat sacerdos secum quando sacrificat lineam et cingulum et amictum et orarium et planetas, et in manu teneat mappula et sudorum trilice in honore sanctae Trinitatis propter sacrificium ponendum super altare.

---

12 patribus ex patres corr. NI    27 solus ex solum corr. NI    29 solus ex solum corr. NI  
32 Dominus vobiscum in marg. NI    34 Filium] neque credit s.s. NI

Et in nullo permittimus sine lumine accenso sacrificare. Qui sine lumine accenso  
 45 sacrificaverit videtur esse sacrificium cecum. Absit hoc. Non permittat Deus ut hoc  
 fiat sacrificium cecum esse apud Christianos quia si lumen accensum habet,  
 perfecta Trinitas ibi videtur habere virtutem quia oleum aut cera et paperunt et  
 flamma Trinitatem significat.

Ecce alia sententia sanctae Trinitatis quia inde lumen pro vice Christi sicut ipse  
 50 dixit, Ego sum lux mundi (Jo 8:12). Et habeat incensum quia quando angeli  
 Sathane ceciderunt de caelo in terram in fetore ceciderunt. Cum odorem incensi  
 facit sacerdos ad altare, praesentialiter fugit diabolus et ille odor per angelos ante  
 Deum ascendit, et incensum et odorem et ignis Trinitatem significat.

Et quando offert Domino in altare, non solum panem quia si solum panem ponit  
 55 videtur Pater non habere Filium. Si panem et vinum poni, videtur esse Pater cum  
 Filio et non habere Spiritum Sanctum. Si panem et vinum et aquam adunatim,  
 videtur esse Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus.

Unde dicimus, Sanctus Sanctus Sanctus ter in honorem sancte Trinitatis. Et si  
 solum ignem habet ad sacrificandum, videtur esse Pater et non habere Filium quia  
 60 lumen accensum Trinitatem sanctam in se significat.

Quia qui sacrificat non in sorte adulterii sed mundus ab omni coinquinatione  
 adulterii sacrificaverit quia sacerdos Trinitatem interpretatur: Pater sa-, Filius cer-,  
 Spiritus Sanctus -dos. Pater pres-, Filius bi-, Spiritus sanctus -ter. Ergo sacerdos  
 et presbiter Trinitatem intellegere potest.

65 Ergo per trilicem positam in altare et desuper calicem cum oblatione et operi-  
 mentum super calicem similiter sancta Trinitate figuratur.

Ecce sicut diximus iii vicibus Agnus Dei propter sanctam Trinitatem.

Ecce septem sententie sancte Trinitatis in honorem septiformis Spiritus Sancti  
 gratiae.

70 Ergo non praesumat sacerdos aliud facere quando sacrificat nisi quomodo supra  
 diximus ut inluminet se et animas Christianorum illuminet. Et si aliter facere  
 praesumpserit, nec sibi lumen nec aliis Christianis lumen prestat. Sed ille cecus et  
 alios in cecitatem post se trahit.

---

47 paperunt ex paperui corr. NI    55 ponere ex poni corr. NI    56 habere ex haberer corr.  
 NI    57 Pater ex Patrem corr. NI    Filius ex Filium corr. NI    Spiritus Sanctus ex -tum -tum  
 corr. NI    61 sorte ex sorde corr. NI    64 Trinitas ex -tem corr. NI

9. *Extended Penitential Form*

This form is found in V4 (Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Vat. lat. 1349 [s. XI, south Italy], fols. 81r-82v). The text printed here preserves such spelling, grammatical, and syntactical errors as: *sacerdos* (l. 3), *epistula sua* (l. 4), *vestrae fraternitatis* (l. 7), *vestras* (l. 9), *absconse* (l. 11), *missa* (l. 13), *fuisse* (l. 17), *patres sancti* (ll. 17-18), *hora tertia* (l. 22), *Alii* (l. 23), *solum sacrificaret* (l. 26), *salutem* (l. 27), *habent* (l. 30), *Si* (l. 33), *fuerit* (l. 36), *ammitum* (l. 40), *planeta* (l. 41), *sudario* (l. 41), *lumen accensus* (l. 43), *sorte* (l. 59), *aduteriis* (l. 60), *sacrifices* (l. 60), *trilicemcem* (l. 70), *posita* (l. 70), and *si* (l. 72).

EPISTULA BEATI DAMASI PAPE AD IERONIMO PRESBITERO DE ORDINE MISSARUM XLVI

Dum quadam die resideret sanctissimus papa Damasus in sede beati Petri apostoli, intentio orta est in tota ecclesia Romana de sacrificio qua hora licet sacerdos offerre, et non inveniabant exinde finem. Tunc transmisit epistula sua ad beatum  
5 Hieronimum Hierusolimis ita.

DAMASUS PAPA IERONIMO PRESBITERO IN DOMINO SALUTEM

Dirigimus vestrae fraternitatis quia intentio orta est in tota ecclesia Romana de sacrificio qua hora sacrificaret et non invenimur exinde finem. Dirigat nobis sanctitas vestras vos qui omnia scrutasti quomodo exinde exigamus.

10

HIERONIMUS

Pater sanctissime, veritatis vobis minime est absconse. Recordare concilium Niceni ubi cccxviii patres sancti: affixum et constitutum est ab eis, si quis die dominico sacerdos supra hora tertia ausus fuerit canere missa, anathematizetur; aliis diebus a tertia usque in nona, similiter anathematizetur; aliis vero horis licitum  
15 est sacrificare.

Cumque lecta fuisse epistula, invenerunt in concilio scriptum a cccxviii patres sancti qui inflammati fuerunt de Spiritu Sancto quomodo in Nicena coram Constantino magnifico et catholico ac sanctissimo imperatore scripserunt et constituerunt, si quis die dominico sacerdos supra tertia ausus fuerit canere missam,  
20 in damnatione anathematizetur.

Pro eo quod Spiritus Sanctus hora tertia descendit ad apostolos, ideo non est licitum post hora tertia die dominico nec sacrificare nec ieiunare. Siquis per neglectum ieiunaverit, vii dies peniteat in pane et aqua. Alii vero diebus a media hora iiii usque in media hora viii, similiter anathematizetur, pro eo quod ista hora  
 25 Christus in patibulo crucis stetit pro nostra salute.

Et ipsa sacrificia quando sacrificaverit sacerdos, non praesumat solum sacrificaret quia Christus quando sacrificium pro totius mundi salutem immolari permisit, duo latrones immolari cum eo. Ergo si solum sacrificaverit, cui dicet, Dominus vobiscum? Melius est illi diceret, Dominus mecum et cum spiritu meo. Ecce satis  
 30 blasphemat si duo vel iii non habet ministros. Et si hoc habent, sana fide potest dicere, Dominus vobiscum et illi respondentes, Et tu sic nobis optasti ut Deus esset nobiscum, et nos optamus ut sit Deus cum spiritu tuo. Quia si solus sacrificaverit, videtur esse Pater solus, nec Filium, nec Spiritum Sanctum in Trinitate esse. Si cum ministro uno sacrificat, ergo dicet, Dominus tecum. Ab illo sit longe. Si cum duo  
 35 ministros sacrificaverit, videtur in eo esse perfecta Trinitas. Et aliter, ergo cum sacrificat habeat secum duos ministros. Si ergo dicit, Ubi duo vel tres fuerit in nomine meo in medio eorum sum (Mt 18:20). Et in alio loco, tres testimonia apud Deum firmata sunt (1 Jo 5:7-8?). Et si plures sunt, quam melius sunt apud Deum et hominem.

40 Et habeat sacerdos secum quando sacrificat lineam et cingulum et ammitum et orarium et planeta, et in manu teneat manipulum et sudario trilecem in onore Trinitatis propter sacrificium ponendo super altare.

Et in nullo permittimus sine lumen accensus sacrificare quia si sine lumen accensus sacrificaverit, videtur esse sacrificium cecum. Absit. Non permittat Deus ut hoc fiat  
 45 sacrificium cecum esse Christianos quia si lumen accensus habet, perfecta Trinitas sibi videtur habere virtutem quia oleum aut ceram et papirum et flamma Trinitate significat.

Ecce alia sententia significat Trinitatem, qui inde lumen pro vice Christi sicut ipse dixit, Ego sum lux mundi (Jo 8:12). Et habeat incensum quia quando angeli Satane  
 50 ceciderunt de caelo in terra, in fetore ceciderunt. Et cum odore incensi facit sacerdos ad altare, praesentialiter fugit diabolus et illum odorem per angelos ante Deum ascendit. Et incensum et odorem et ignem Trinitatem significat.

Et quando offerunt Domino in altare, non solum panem quia si solum pane poni, videtur esse Pater cum Filio non haberet Spiritum Sanctum. Si panem et vinum et  
 55 aqua adunatim, videtur esse Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum.

---

36 secum *ex secundos corr. V4*    43 accensus *ex -sum corr. V4*

Unde dicimus, Sanctus Sanctus Sanctus iii vicibus in honorem sanctae Trinitatis. Et si solum ignem habet ad sacrificandum, videtur esse Patrem non aberet Filium nec Spiritum Sanctum quia lumen accensum Trinitatem significat.

Quia qui sacrificat non sorte adulteriis sed mundus ab omni coinquinatione  
60 aduteriis sacrifices quia sacerdos Trinitas imperat:

	Pater sanctificat, Filius clarificat,						
	P	S	F	C			
	Spiritus Sanctus de Patre procedens, et Filio benedicens						
	S	S	D	P	P	F	B
65	sanctificans sacrificium taliter consumatur Pater, Filius,						
	S	S	T	ERGO	S	C	
	Spiritus Sanctus, Pater, Filius, Spiritus Sanctus.						
	D	ET	P	B	T		
	Trinitas intellegi potest.						

70 Ergo trilicemcem posita in altare et desuper ponit sacerdos calicem, similiter sanctam Trinitatem figuratur.

Ecc<e> si diximus iii vicibus Agnus Dei propter sanctam Trinitatem in honore septiforme Spiritus Sancti gratiae.

Ergo non praesumat sacerdos aliut facere quando sacrificat nisi quomodo supra  
75 diximus, ut illuminet se et animas Christianorum illuminet. Et si aliter facere praesumpserit, nec sibi lumen nec aliis Christianis lumen praestat. Sed ille cecus et aliud in cecitati post se trait.

---

57 Filium ex Filius corr. V4

## 10. *Vulgate Form*

This form appears in the following manuscripts:

### *Collection in Five Books*

MC2 = Monte Cassino, Archivio della Badia 125 (s. xi<sup>2</sup>/4?, Monte Cassino), pp. 155-157

V5 = Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Vat. lat. 1339 (s. xi med., prov. Narni), fols. 135v-136v

Va2 = Rome, Biblioteca Vallicelliana B 11 (before 1087, Sant'Eutizio in Val Castoriana), fols. 129v-131r.

### *Derivatives of the Collection in Five Books*

F = Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana (s. xi, central Italy), fols. 94v-96v

T = Toledo, Biblioteca Capitular 22-32 (s. xi, central Italy, prov. Viterbo), pp. 212-219

A = Rome, Biblioteca Angelica 1447 (s. XI, central Italy), pp. 46-48

Va3 = Rome, Biblioteca Vallicelliana F 92 (s. XI ex., Sant'Eutizio in Val Castoriana), fols. 190v-192r

Ma2 = Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional 373 (s. XI/XII, south Italy), fols. 61r-64r

N2 = Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale XII A 28 (s. XI/XII, central Italy), fols. 69r-72r

V6 = Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Vat. lat. 4317 (s. XI/XII, Farfa?), fols. 151v-153v.

The text printed here is taken from MC2, the oldest manuscript of the south Italian *Collection in Five Books*, and has been collated with the other manuscripts listed above. Glosses in the codices have been reported in the first apparatus since some glosses have been incorporated into the text (e.g., *scrutati estis*, l. 9 in A). Textual variants are reported according to chronological sequence with those in the *Collection in Five Books* first and then those in the derivative collections.

It should be noted that the text in MC2 is at variance with all the others at several points beyond purely erroneous readings: *questio* (ll. 3, 7), *quibus horis* (l. 8), and *et qui hoc praesumpserit* (ll. 23-24). The great number of variant readings in ll. 23-24 is reported in full. Shared readings indicate that Va2 and Ma2 are very close and that T and N2 bear some resemblance. These four witnesses all have Beneventan-script symptoms.

MC2 has generally been dated to c. 1025, although the abbreviations have suggested to some that it might have been written somewhat later.<sup>51</sup>

V5 was written around the middle of the eleventh century in 'romanesca', but was clearly based on a Beneventan-script model, as its Beneventan-script symptoms show.<sup>52</sup> It has often been stated that the manuscript originated at Farfa, but more recently a Narni origin has been suggested. Even this suggestion, however, remains a hypothesis, although it is clear that the codex was once in Narni.<sup>53</sup>

Va2 was written at Sant'Eutizio in Val Castoriana in part by Ubertus, a monk and later abbot there, whose death is recorded by at least 1087.<sup>54</sup> Although the manuscript is written in 'romanesca', it exhibits Beneventan-script symptoms; textually it is often closer to MC2 than to V5.

F contains a celebrated *ordo missae*<sup>55</sup> together with a canonical collection in

<sup>51</sup> See E. A. Loew, *The Beneventan Script. A History of the South Italian Minuscule*, 2nd enlarged edition prepared by Virginia Brown, 2 vols. (Sussidi eruditi 33-34; Rome, 1980), 1.211, 213, 344; and Mordek, *Kirchenrecht*, p. 100 n. 15.

<sup>52</sup> Reynolds, 'South Italian *Liturgica*', 488 n. 25; and Supino Martini, *Roma e l'area*, pp. 226 f. and n. 69.

<sup>53</sup> Supino Martini, *ibid.*, p. 229.

<sup>54</sup> *ibid.*, p. 205.

<sup>55</sup> See Adalbert Ebner, *Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte und Kunstgeschichte des Missale Romanum im Mittelalter: Iter Italicum* (Freiburg i. Br., 1896), pp. 300-302.

seventeen books called the *Collectio Riccardiana*. L. viii deals with the eucharist and contains our Mass commentary.

Although copied in an inelegant eleventh-century minuscule, T has numerous Beneventan-script symptoms. The canonical collection in this codex, the *Collectio Toletana*,<sup>56</sup> is derived largely from the *Collection in Five Books* and Burchard's *Decretum*. The collection itself is farraginous, and our Mass commentary has been inserted helter-skelter after canons from Burchard's *Decretum* and before canons from L. iv of the *Collection in Five Books*.

A contains the *Collectio Angelica* in thirteen books, which is based largely on the *Collection in Five Books* with material also from the *Collection in Seventy-Four Titles*.<sup>57</sup> Our Mass commentary is c. 77 of L. iv and precedes a number of canons on the eucharist.

Va3, like Va2, was written at Sant'Eutizio but somewhat after the time of Ubertus. Besides liturgical material, the codex has a canon law and penitential section that draws on the *Decretum* of Burchard of Worms and the *Collection in Five Books*. As might be expected from its origin, our text in this manuscript is related to that in Va2.

The portion of Ma2 containing our text is written in both normal minuscule and Beneventan script. The collection in four books, in which our text appears as c. 32 of L. iv, is clearly dependent on the *Collection in Five Books*.

N2, a codex written in ordinary minuscule, also displays Beneventan-script symptoms. It contains a canonical collection based on the *Collection in Five Books* and is divided into five parts. Our commentary, c. 83 of L. iii, introduces a group of canons on the eucharist.

V6 contains the *Liber multiloquiorum in Seven Books* written in the late eleventh or early twelfth century in 'romanesca' but with Beneventan-script symptoms. The codex itself has been attributed perhaps to Farfa or vicinity on the basis of its reference on fol. 1r to Abbot Berardus ii and a text from Pope Sylvester to Hugh of Farfa.<sup>58</sup> Recently, on the basis of the script, decoration, and a fourteenth-century note giving its provenance as a monastery 'sancti Benedicti', Paola Supino Martini has placed the origin of the codex not in Farfa itself but in a Benedictine house with Farfese connections.<sup>59</sup> The *Liber multiloquiorum* derives largely from the *Collection in Five Books*, a codex of which is thought to have been at Farfa; our Mass commentary appears as c. 39 of L. iv, a book that also contains such other liturgical commentaries as the *Dominus vobiscum*.

<sup>56</sup> Reynolds, 'Law, Canon: to Gratian', 408.

<sup>57</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>58</sup> Roger E. Reynolds, 'The "Isidorian" *Epistula ad Leudefredum*: An Early Medieval Epitome of the Clerical Duties', *Mediaeval Studies* 41 (1979) 306.

<sup>59</sup> Supino Martini, *Roma e l'area*, pp. 297 f.



## CCXXXV INCIPIT ORDO QUOMODO SACERDOS DEBET SACRIFICARE

Dum quadam die resideret sanctissimus papa Damasus in sede beati Petri apostoli, questio orta est in tota ecclesia Romana de sacrificio quibus horis liceret sacerdos sacrificium offerre, et non inveniebatur. Tunc transmisit epistulam suam ad beatum  
 5 Hieronimum presbiterum Hyerosolimis ita.

## DAMASUS PAPA HIERONIMO PRESBITERO IN DOMINO AETERNAM SALUTEM

Dirigimus vestrae fraternitati quia questio orta est in tota ecclesia Romana de sacrificio quibus horis licet sacrificare et non invenimus exinde finem. Dirigat nobis sanctitas vestra vos qui omnia scrutatis quomodo exinde agamus.

10

## HIERONIMUS

Pater sanctissime, veritas in vobis minime est absconsa. Recordare concilium Nicenum ubi a cccis x et viii patribus sanctis affixum et constitutum est, siquis die dominico resurrectionis post horam tertiam ausus fuerit canere missam, anathematizetur; aliis vero diebus a tertia usque in horam nonam si praesumpserit,  
 15 similiter anathematizetur; aliis vero horis licitum est sacrificare.

---

2 Dum] .i. quando MC2 resideret] .i. sedere MC2 sanctissimus] .i. beatissimus MC2  
 3 orta] .i. nata MC2 4 Tunc] .i. Deinde MC2 5 ita] .i. sic MC2 7 Dirigimus] .i.  
 Mandamus MC2 8 Dirigat] .i. Mandet MC2 9 scrutatis] .i. estis MC2 agamus] .i. faciamus  
 MC2 12 affixum] .i. confirmatum MC2: .i. affirmatum V5 A constitutum] .i. habeis MC2

---

1 cccxxv] clxiii V5: clxxiii Va2: lxxvii A: xxxii Ma2: lxxxiii N2: xxxviii V6: om. F T Va3  
 Incipit ... sacrificare] In Christi nomine incipit celebrationis misse T: De horis dierum in quibus  
 sacrificare oportet V6 Quomodo] Quod V5 Va2 Va3 N2: Quando F Debeat A 2 die om.  
 Va3 resisteret Va3 Damascus T sedem Va2 FN2 beatissimi V6 3 questio] intentio  
 V5 Va2 F T A Va3 Ma2 N2 V6 toto T Romana ecclesia Va3 qua hora V5 Va2 F T A Va3  
 Ma2 N2 V6 licet T A sacerdos] ad add. V5: om. Va3: sacerdoti V6 4 offeri T  
 inveniebatur] -bant N2: -bat V6 epistulas suas V5 Va2 F T A Va3 Ma2 N2 V6 5 Hieronimus  
 presbiter Va3 Hierosolimis V5: Hierosolymis Va2 6 Damascus T eterna T 7 Dirigi-  
 mus] Diligimus N2 fraternitatis T questio] intentio V5 Va2 F T A Va3 Ma2 N2 V6 toto  
 T Romana ecclesia Va3 8 qua hora V5 Va2 F T A Va3 Ma2 N2 V6 licet] liceat V6:  
 sacerdos add. T fine Va2 F 9 vestra] vestras T vos om. V6 scrutatis] scrutasti T: scrutati  
 estis A: scrutamini V6 10 Hieronime T: Hieronimi Responsio A 11 vobis] nobis T V6 est  
 om. T absconsa est Va3 concilium] domine add. N2 12 a om. Ma2 patres Va2 Ma2  
 sanctis] est add. A: sancti Va2 T Ma2 adfixum Va2 F Ma2 N2 est om. A 13 resurrectio  
 Va2 Ma2 hora Va2 T Ma2 N2 tertia Va2 T Ma2 N2 missa Va2 T Ma2 14 alii Va2  
 aliis ... 15 anathematizetur om. Ma2 vero om. Va2 F Va3 A diebus] si sacrificaverit add.  
 A hora Va3 T nona V5 Va2 T si om. A praesumpserit om. A 15 similiter om. T  
 hores N2

Cum relecta fuisset epistula, invenerunt in concilio scriptum a cccis x et viii patribus sanctis qui inflammati fuerunt de Spiritu Sancto quomodo in Nicena sancti coram Constantino magnifico et catholico et sanctissimo imperatore scripserunt et constituerunt, siquis die dominico post horam tertiam ausus fuerit canere missam, in dampnatione anathematizetur.

Pro eo quod Spiritus Sanctus hora iiiia descendit ad apostolos, ideo non licet post horam iiiia die dominico sacrificare nec ieiunare nec ullam abstinentiam habere. De aliis vero diebus a media hora iiiia usque in media hora viiia, et qui hoc praesumpserit, similiter anathematizetur pro eo quod istis horis Christus in passione et patibulo crucis stetit pro nostra salute. Ideoque si in istis horis praesumpserit sacrificare, angeli non recipiunt sacrificium ad offerendum maiestati. Ergo quid prodest illud sacrificium?

Et ipsa sacrificia quando sacrificaverit sacerdos, non praesumat solum sacrificare quia Christus quando sacrificium pro totius mundi salute immolari se permisit, duo

---

17 inflammati] .i. accensi MC2    21 ideo] .i. propterea vel idcirco MC2    26 praesumpserit] .i. ausus fuerit MC2

---

16 Cum] Cumque V5 Va2 FA Va3 N2 V6    conciliis N2    17 sanctis patribus V6    patres Va2 Ma2    sancti Va2 F Ma2    sanctis patribus V6    inflammati Va3    Sancto Spiritu Ma2 quomodo om. Va3    in Nicena] in Nicena N2    Nicena] Nica Va3: Nicea A    sancti om. T    sancto Ma2    18 Constantino] magno et add. Ma2    catholica Ma2    et?] ac V5 Va2 FA T Va3 V6: a N2    imperator T    19 siquis] in add. A    hora F T V6    tertiam V5 Va2 F T Ma2 V6    20 missas V5 Va2 F Ma2 N2 V6: missa T    in om. T    dampnatione om. T    dampnatione V5 Va2 F Ma2 V6    21 horam V6    tertiam V6    ad] super F    licet] die dominico add. Va3    22 hora T N2    iiiia] tertiam Va2 FA Va3 Ma2 V6: nec add. Va3    die] diem F: om. Va3    dominico om. Va3    abstinentia N2    habere] nisi a malo tantum add. A    De] In A    23 vero diebus ... hora viiia] vero diebus a media hora iiiia usque ad aliam mediam horam iiiiam a quarta in mediam horam octavam V5: vero diebus a media hora iiiia usque ad aliam mediam horam iiiia a quarta in media hora octava Va2: vero diebus a media hora tertia usque ad aliam mediam horam iiiia a iiiia in mediam horam octavam F: vero diebus a media hora iiiia usque ad aliam mediam horam iiiia similiter anathematizetur a iiiia usque in mediam horam viiia T: vero diebus sacrificet a media hora tertia usque ad mediam horam iiiiam a quarta media usque in horam viiia si sacrificaverit A: vero diebus a media hora tertiam usque ad aliam mediam horam quartam a quarta in media hora octava Va3: vero diebus a media hora iii usque ad aliam media hora iiiia a quarta in media hora viii Ma2: vero diebus a media hora tertia usque ad aliam media hora iiiia a iiiia in mediam horam viii N2: vero diebus a media hora tertia usque ad aliam mediam horam iiiia a quinta in mediam horam viii V6 23-24 et ... praesumpserit om. V5 Va2 F T A Va3 Ma2 N2 V6    24 ista hora V5 Va2 F T A Va3 Ma2 N2: istas horas V6    25 et] in Va2 FA Va3 Ma2: in add. V5 T N2 V6    stetit] stent T salutem T    si om. T    in om. Va2 F T A Va3 Ma2 N2 V6    istas horas V5 Va2 F Va3 Ma2 N2 V6: ista hora T    26 maiestatis Va2 T    27 Ergo quid ... 29 sacrificium? om. T    Quid ergo A    quid] quod N2    illud] illum Va2 F Ma2 N2    28 ipsa] ipsum T: ipso N2    sacrificium T Ma2    sacrificaverint Va3    solus V5 Va2 F T A Va3 Ma2 N2 V6    29 salutem T N2    inmolari T    duos V5 Va2 A Ma2

30 latrones in cruce fuerunt cum eo. Ergo si solus sacrificaverit sacerdos, cui dicit,  
 Dominus vobiscum? Certe melius est illi dicere, Dominus mecum et ipse respon-  
 deat, Et cum spiritu meo. Ecce satis blasphematur si duos vel tres non habet  
 ministros. Et si habet, sana fide potest dicere, Dominus vobiscum et illi ei  
 respondentes, Et tu sicut nobis optasti ut Deus esset nobiscum, et nos optamus ut  
 35 sit Dominus cum spiritu tuo. Quia si solus sacrificat, videtur Pater esse solus,  
 Filium et Spiritum Sanctum in Trinitate non esse. Si cum uno ministro sacrifica-  
 verit, ergo cui dicit, Dominus vobiscum? Melius est ei dicere, Dominus tecum vel  
 nobiscum. Absit. Si cum duobus ministris sacrificat, videtur esse perfecta Trinitas.  
 Et aliter, ergo qui sacrificat habeat secum duos ministros sicut Dominus in  
 40 evangelio dicit, Ubi duo vel tres steterint in nomine meo in medio eorum sum (Mt  
 18:20). Et in omni loco, tres testimonia apud Deum firmata sunt (1 Jo 5:7-8?).  
 Et si plus sunt, ecce quam melius sunt apud Deum et hominem.

Et habeat sacerdos secum quando sacrificat lineam et cingulum et amictum et  
 orarium et planetam, et in manu teneat manipulum et sudarium trilicem in  
 45 honorem sanctae Trinitatis propter sacrificium ponendum super altare.

Ecce una sententia sanctae Trinitatis, Et in nullo permittimus sine lumine accen-  
 sum sacrificare quia qui sine lumine accensum sacrificaverit, videtur esse sacrifi-  
 cium caecum. Absit hoc. Non permittat Deus ut fiat sacrificium caecum esse apud

---

31 *in marg.* Nota Dominus vobiscum *A* 36 *in marg.* Nota minus quanties ministri *A*  
 37 tecum] .i. ab illos sit longe *MC2* 40 dicit] .i. ait *MC2* 40 sum] ego *A* 44 *in marg.* Nota  
 vestimenta sacerdotis *A* lineam] .i. *MC2* cingulum] .ii. *MC2* amictum] .iii. *MC2*  
 45 orarium] .iiii. *MC2* planetam] .v. *MC2* manipulum] .vi. *MC2* sudarium] .vii. *MC2*  
*in marg.* sudarium unde lingua rustica dicitur corporale *MC2* 49 caecum] .i. obscurum *MC2*  
 Absit] .i. Non fiat *MC2*

---

30 cum eo fuerunt *A* 31 est *om. N2* illi *om. A N2* 32 pblasphematur *Va2* duo *Va2*  
*Va3 Ma2 N2* 33 illi] ille *F: ile T* 34 respondeant *A* esset] esse *T* 35 si *om. V6*  
 sacrificaverit *Ma2* esse Pater *Va3* 36 Filium] Filius *TA* Spiritus Sanctus *TA* in Trinitate  
 non esse] non esset cum illo in Trinitate *T* 37 est *om. A* ei *om. FA Va3 N2* vel] idest *T*  
 38 nobiscum] nobis *T* Adsit *V6* ministros *V6* sacrificaverit *N2* esset *T* perfecta  
 esse *A* 39 qui] si *N2* duo *Va3* 40 dicit] ait *T* duos *Va2* steterunt *T* 41 tres]  
 tria *V5 TA Va3* firmata sunt apud Deum *Va3* 42 si *om. V6* sunt] est *Va2 T Ma2*  
 44 linea *Va2 F Va3 Ma2 N2* cingulum *Va3* 45 planeta *N2* manum *Va2* mappulam  
*V5 Ma2 V6* mappula *Va2 F Va3 N2* trilice *F Va3* in] propter *Va3* 46 honore *V5 TA*  
*Ma2 N2* propter] ad *Va3* 47 Ecce ... Trinitatis *om. T* sententiam *Va2* nullo] ullo *Va3*:  
 nulla *T* lumen *Va2 Ma2* accenso *V5 F TA Va3 N2 V6* 48 lumen *Va2 Ma2* accenso  
*V5 FA Va3 N2 V6* 49 permittat] ergo *add. T* ut *om. A* fiat *om. A* cecum esse]  
 sacrificium *V5*: esse caecum *A*: esse *om. T Ma2 V6*

- 50 Christianos, quia si lumen accensum habet, perfecta Trinitas ibi videtur habere virtutem, quia in olei et cere et papiri flamma Trinitas significatur.

Ecce alia sententia sanctae Trinitatis, Quia inde lumen pro vice Christi ponitur. Omnis sacerdos lumen habeat quando sacrificat quia ipse dixit, Ego sum lux mundi (Jo 8:12). Et habeat incensum quia quando angeli Satanae caeciderunt de caelo in

- 55 terram in faetore caeciderunt. Cum odorem incensi facit sacerdos ad altare, praesentialiter fugit diabolus et ille odor per angelos ante Deum ascendit, et per incensum et odorem et ignem Trinitas significatur.

- Et quando offert Domino in altare, non ponat solum panem quia si solum panem ponit videtur Pater non habere Filium. Si panem et vinum ponit, videtur esse Pater  
60 cum Filio non habere Spiritum Sanctum. Si panem et vinum et aquam adunatum ponit, videtur esse Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus.

Unde dicimus, Sanctus Sanctus Sanctus iii vicibus in honore sanctae Trinitatis. Et si solum ignem habet ad sacrificandum, videtur esse Patrem, non habere Filium nec Spiritum Sanctum quia lumen accensum Trinitatem significat.

- 65 Qui sacrificat non in sorde adulterii sed mundus ab omni iniquatione adulterii sacrificet quia sacerdos Trinitas interpretatur: Pater sa- et Filius cer- et Spiritus Sanctus -dos; Pater pres-, Filius bi-, Spiritus Sanctus -ter. Ecce sacerdos et presbiter Trinitas intelligi potest.

---

53 *in marg.* Nota sacerdos lumen et incensum habet quando sacrificat *A* 54 Satanae] *i.* diaboli *MC2* caeciderunt] *i.* caderunt *MC2* 55 *in marg.* Nota incensi et ignem et odorem *A* 59 *in marg.* Nota panem et vinum et aquam *A* 65 sorde] *i.* inquinato vel contaminatio sive pollutio *MC2* 66 *in marg.* Nota sacerdos presbiter *A*

---

50 accenso *T Va3T* habent *N2* ibi] sibi *T*: ubi *N2* 51 *in om.* *Va2 Ma2* oleum *Va2 Ma2* et<sup>1</sup>] aut *Va2 Ma2* cera *Va2 Ma2* papirum *Va2 Ma2* flammam *Va2 Ma2* Trinitas *T* significat *Va2 Ma2* 52 sanctae Trinitatis sententia *F* quia] qui *Va2 F A Ma2* 54 incensum habet quando sacrificat *A* quia] qui *T* angeli Satanae quando *T* 55 terra *Va2 T Ma2 N2* fetorem *A* odore *T Va3* 56 praesens taliter *T*: presentaliter *Ma2* ille odor] illum odorem *Va2 Ma2* angelum *T* per<sup>2</sup> *om.* *Va2 Ma2* 57 odore *T* igne *T* significat *Va2 Ma2* 58 offertur *Va3* altari *A* panem<sup>1</sup>] pane *Va3* si] qui *Ma2* 59 Patrem *Va3* non *om.* *T* habere] abet *T* esse] esset *T*: *om.* *Va3 A* 60 habere] habet *T* Spiritum Sanctum] -tu *T*: -to *T* aqua *F T N2* adunatum *om.* *T* 60-61 ponit adunatum *A* esset *T* Patrem *Va2 Va3 Ma2* Filium *Va2 F T Va3 Ma2* Spiritum *Va2 F T Va3 Ma2* Sanctum *Va2 F T Va3 Ma2* 62 iii] tribus *V5 A Va3 N2 V6* 63 solus *T* esse *om.* *V5 T A Ma2 N2 V6* Pater *T* habere] abet *T* Filium *om.* *F* nec] et *A* 63-64 nec Spiritum Sanctum *om.* *V5 Va2 F T Ma2 N2 V6* 64 Trinitas *Va2 Ma2*: Trinitate *T* significat] Et *add.* *A* 65 Qui] Quia *N2* sorte *T* sed ... adulterii *om.* *N2* sed] set *T* 66 sacrificat *Va3* quia] qua *Va3* interpretatur] significatur *N2* et<sup>1</sup> *om.* *T A* cer- ... 67 Filius *om.* *Va3* et<sup>2</sup> *om.* *T* 67 bi-] et *add.* *Va3* 68 presbiteri *N2* intellegi *Va2 T Va3 N2*

Ergo trilecem positam in altare et desuper calicem cum oblatione et operimento  
70 super calicem similiter sancta Trinitas figuratur.

Ecce sicut diximus tres Agnus Dei propter sanctam Trinitatem.

Ecce septem sententiae sanctae Trinitatis in honorem septiformis Spiritus Sancti gratiae.

Ergo non praesumat sacerdos aliud facere quando sacrificat nisi quomodo supra-  
75 diximus ut illuminet se et animam Christianorum. Et si aliter facere praesumpserit,  
nec sibi lumen nec aliis Christianis praestat. Sed ille caecus est et alios in  
caecitatem post se trahit. Audi Christum dicentem, Si caecus caecum duxerit ambo  
in foveam cadunt (Mt 15:14, Lc 6:39).

---

69 in marg. Nota trilecem A

---

69 Ergo] per *add. A* et *add. N2* posito *T*: posita *N2* in altare positam *Va3* oblationem  
*T*: oblata *Ma2* operimentu *A* 70 figurantur *N2* 71 tres] vicibus *add. Va2 Ma2*  
72 septem] viiei *V5*: septiae *add. N2* sententiae *om. N2* honore *TA Ma2* septiformes *Va2*:  
septiusforme *T* Sanctus *Ma2* Sancti Spiritus *A* 74 Ergo] Ego *T* quando] quam *T*  
75 et] etiam *N2* animam] -mas *TA V6*: *om. N2* 76 alios] alius *F*: aliis *N2* 77 cecitate *T*  
*Va3* trait *T Va3 N2* caecus] cecum *T N2* caecum] cecum ducatu prebeat *add. A* duxerit  
*om. A*

### 11. *Abbreviated Vulgate Form*

This form appears in the following manuscripts:

V7 = Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Archivio di San Pietro H 58 (s. xi in.,  
Rome), fols. 45v-47r

NY = New York, Hispanic Society of America HC 380/819 (s. xi, Catalonia), fols.  
106v-108r.

The text printed here from V7 contains numerous spelling, grammatical, and syntactical errors such as: *Sacrificaret* (l. 2), *residere* (l. 3), *sedem* (l. 3), *sacerdos* (l. 5), *aeterna* (l. 7), *fraternitatis* (l. 8), *vestras* (l. 10), *sanctitissime* (l. 12), *resurrectio* (l. 14), *missa* (l. 14), *alii* (l. 15), *fuissed* (l. 17), *inverunt* (l. 17), *trecenti ... patres* (ll. 17-18), *sancti*<sup>1, 2</sup> (l. 18), *Niceam* (l. 18), *hora tertia* (l. 20), *equod* (l. 25), *duo ministro* (l. 38), *linea* (l. 43), *manum* (l. 44), *sudari trilece* (l. 44), *lumen accensum* (ll. 46, 47), *sacrificarire* (l. 47), *permittat* (l. 48), *sibi* (l. 49), *angelo* (l. 55), *haberet* (l. 58), *mundum* (l. 64), *trilecem posita* (l. 67), *est* (l. 67), *honororae septiformes* (l. 70), *alius Christianus* (l. 73), and *cecum*<sup>1</sup> (l. 73).

INCIPIT EPISTULA SANCTI DAMASI PAPE HIERONIMO PRESBITERO HIERUSOLIMIS TRANS-  
MISSA QUOMODO SACERDOS DEBET SACRIFICARET

Dum quadam die residere sanctissimus papa Damasus in sedem beati Petri apostoli, intentio horta est in tota ecclesia Romana de sacrificio qua hora licet  
5 sacerdos sacrificium offerre, et non inveniebat. Tunc transmisit epistulas suas ad beatum Hieronimum presbiterum Hierusolimis ita.

DAMASUS PAPE HIERONIMO PRESBITERO IN DOMINO AETERNA SALUTEM

Dirigimus vestrae fraternitatis quia intentio horta est in tota aecclesia Romana de sacrificio qua hora licet sacrificari et non invenimus exinde finem. Dirigat nobis  
10 sanctitas vestras vos qui omnia scrutatis quomodo exinde agamus.

HIERONIMO

Pater sanctitissime, veritas in vobis minime est absconsa. Recordare concilium Niceni ubi trecenti decem et octo patres sancti affixum et constitutum est ab eis, siquis die dominico resurrectio post hora tertia ausus fuerit canere missa, anathe-  
15 matizetur; alii diebus a tertia usque in hora octava si praesumpserit, similiter anathematizetur; aliis vero horis licitum est sacrificare.

Cumque relecta fuisset epistula, inverunt in concilio scriptum a trecenti x et octo patres sancti qui inflammati fuerunt de Spiritu Sancto quomodo in Niceam sancti coram Constantino magnifico hac sanctissimo imperatore scripserunt et constitue-  
20 runt, siquis die dominico sacrificare post hora tertia ausus fuerit canere missas, in dampnatione anathematizetur.

Pro eo quod Spiritus Sanctus hora tertia descendit ad apostolos, ideo non licet post hora tertia die dominico nec sacrificare nec ieiunare nec ullam abstinentiam abere.

---

1 Sancti *om. NY* Pape] Directa *add. NY* Hierusolimis Transmissa *om. NY* 2 Quomodo] Qualiter Vel Quibusmodis *NY* Sacrificare Debeat *NY* 3 resideret *NY* sede *NY* 4 liceat *NY* 5 sacerdoti *NY* misit *NY* 6 beatissimum *NY* Hierosolimis *NY* 7 aeternam *NY* 8 fraternitati *NY* 9 liceat *NY* invenimus *NY* 10 vestra *NY* vos *om. NY* qui] quae *NY* scrutatur *NY* 11 Iheronimae *NY* 12 sanctissime *NY* veritas] enim *add. NY* minime] nulla *NY* Recordamini *NY* concilii *NY* 13 trecenti] fuerunt *add. NY* sancti] quomodo *add. NY* fixum *NY* 14 resurrectionis *NY* horam *NY* terciam *NY* missam *NY* 15 aliis *NY* in] ad *NY* horam *NY* octava] nonam *NY* 17 fuisset *NY* invenerunt *NY* 18 patribus *NY* sanctis *NY* inflamati *NY* Nicena *NY* 19 magnifico] et catholico *add. NY* constituerunt] ut *add. NY* 20 horam *NY* terciam *NY* fuerit] aut *add. NY* missam *NY* 22 horam *NY* terciam *NY*

De aliis vero diebus a media hora tertia usque alia media hora quarta in media hora  
 25 nocturna, similiter anathematizetur pro equod ista hora Christus in passione in  
 patibulo crucis stetit pro nostra salute. Ideoque si istam horam presumpserit  
 sacrificare, angeli recipiunt sacrificium ad offerendum maiestatis. Ergo quid  
 prodest illum sacrificium?

Et ipsa sacrificia quando sacrificaverit sacerdos, non praesumat solum sacrificare  
 30 quia Christus quando sacrificium pro totius mundi salute immolari se permisit, duo  
 latrones in cruce fuerunt cum eo. Certe melius est illi dicere, Dominus mecum, et  
 ipse respondeat, Et cum spiritu meo. Ecce satis blasphaemat si duo vel tres non  
 habet ministros. Et si abet, sana fide dici potest, Dominus vobiscum et illi ei  
 respondeat, Et tu sicut nobis optasti Deus esse nobiscum et ut nos optamus ut sit  
 35 Dominus cum spiritu tuo. Quia si solum sacrificat, videtur Pater esse solus, Filium  
 nec Spiritum Sanctum in Trinitate non esse. Si cum uno ministro sacrificaverit,  
 ergo cui dicit, Dominus vobiscum? Melius ei dicere, Dominus tecum vel nobiscum.  
 Absit. Si cum duo ministro sacrificat, videtur esse perfecta Trinitas. Et aliter, ergo  
 qui sacrificat habeat secum duos ministros sicut Dominus dicit in evangelio, Ubi  
 40 duo vel tres steterint in nomine meo in medio eorum sum (Mt 18:20). Et in omni  
 loco, tres testimonia apud Deum firmata sunt (1 Jo 5:7-8?). Et si plus sunt, ecce  
 quam melius sunt apud Deum et hominem.

Et abeat sacerdos secum quando sacrificat linea et cingulum et amictum et orarium  
 et planetam, et in manum teneat mappulam et sudari trilice in honore sancte  
 45 Trinitatis propter sacrificium ponendum super altare.

Ecce una sententia sanctae Trinitatis, Et in nullo permittimus sine lumen accensum  
 sacrificarire quia qui sine lumen accensum sacrificaverit, videtur esse sacrificium  
 cecum. Absit hoc, et non permittat Deus ut fiat sacrificium cecum esse aput  
 Christianos quia si lumen accensum habet, perfecta Trinitas sibi videtur havere  
 50 virtute quia oleum aut cera et papyrum flammas Trinitas significat.

Ecce alia sententia sanctae Trinitatis, Qui inde lumen pro vice Christi ponitur.  
 Omnis sacerdos lumen habeat quando sacrificat quia ipse dixit, Ego sum lux mundi

---

24 usque] ad *add. NY* aliam *NY* mediam *NY* hora] horam *NY* quarta] terciam *NY*  
 25 equod] eo quod *NY* ista *NY* hora *NY* 27 angeli] non *add. NY* maiestati *NY*  
 28 sacrificium illud *NY* 29 ipsa sacrificia *om. NY* solus *NY* 30 quando] in *add. NY*  
 imolari *NY* 31 Ergo si solus sacrificaverit sacerdos, cui dicit, Dominus vobiscum? *add. NY* illi  
*om. NY* 32 duos *NY* 33 potest dicere *NY* 33-34 et illi ei ... esse nobiscum *om. NY*  
 34 ut *om. NY* 35 solum] solus *NY* 36 Si] vero *add. NY* 37 Melius] est *add. NY*  
 38 duobus *NY* ministris *NY* Et aliter *om. NY* 40 tres] tria *NY* 43 lineam *NY*  
 44 manu *NY* mappulam *NY* sudarium *NY* 46 lumine *NY* accenso *NY* 47 sacrificare  
*NY* lumine *NY* accenso *NY* 48 et *om. NY* permittat *NY* esse *om. NY* apud *NY*  
 49 sibi] ibi *NY* 50 virtutem *NY* aut] et *NY* cerae *NY* et] aut *NY* papiri *NY*  
 flamma *NY* Trinitatem *NY* significant *NY* 51 Qui] Et *NY* 52 ipse] Dominus *add. NY*  
 habeat *NY*

(Jo 8:12). Et habead incensum quia quando angeli Sathanae ceciderunt de caelo in terra, in fetore caeciderunt. Cum odore incensi facit sacerdos ad altare, 55 praesentialiter fugit diabolus et illo odore per angelo ante Deum ascendit, et incensum et odorem et ignem Trinitas significat.

Et quando offert Domino in altare, non solum panem quia si solum pane poni videtur Pater non haberet Filium. Si panem et vinum poni, videtur Pater esse cum Filio non habet Spiritum Sanctum. Si panem et vinum et aquam adunatum poni, 60 videtur esse Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum.

Unde dicimus, Sanctus Sanctus Sanctus iibus vicibus in honore sanctae Trinitatis. Et si solum ignem habet ad sacrificandum, videtur esse Patrem non haberet Filium quia lumen accensum Trinitas significat.

Qui sacrificat, non in sordide adulterii sed mundum ab omni iniquatione adulterii 65 sacrificaverit quia sacerdos Trinitas interpretatur: Pater sa- et Filius cer- et Spiritus Sanctus -dos. Pater. Ecce sacerdos et presbiter Trinitas intellegi potest.

Ergo trilecem posita altare et desuper calicem cum oblatione est et operimento super calicem similiter sancta Trinitas figuratur.

Ecce sicut diximus iies Agnus Dei propter sanctam Trinitatem.

70 Ecce sanctae Trinitatis in honoratae septiformes Spiritus Sancti gratiae.

Ergo non presumat sacerdos alius facere quando sacrificat nisi quomodo supradiximus ut illuminet se et animas Christianorum. Et si aliter facere presumpserit, nec sibi lumen nec alius Christianus praestat. Audi Christum dicentem, Si cecum cecum duxerit ambo in foveam cadunt (Mt 15:14; Lc 6:39).

---

54 terram NY Cum] vero add. NY odorem NY altarem NY 55 ille NY odor NY angelos NY 56 odor NY ignis NY Trinitatem NY significant NY 57 offert] sacerdos add. NY altari NY solum] offert add. NY solus NY panis NY poni] ponatur NY 58 habere NY panis NY poni] ponatur NY 59 Filio] et add. NY habere NY poni] ponitur NY 60 esse om. NY 62 habere NY 63 Trinitatem NY 64 sordibus NY mundus NY 65 sacrificet NY 66 Pater om. NY intelligi NY 67 trilece NY posita] in add. NY altari NY est] aetiam NY 69 Ecce sicut] Et NY dicimus NY iies] ter NY 70 Ecce] septem sententiae add. NY: in marg. septem add. V7 honore NY septiformis NY 71 aliud NY 73 aliis NY Christianis NY praestat] Sed ille caecus est et alios in cecitatem post se trahit add. NY cecum] caecus NY



## FURTHER ASTRONOMICAL MATERIAL OF ABBO OF FLEURY

Ron B. Thomson

ABBO of Fleury (Abbo Floriacensis) was born about 945 in or near Orléans and died (perhaps murdered) at Réole in 1004. Among his various extant writings are several short astronomical treatises, two of which I have recently published.<sup>1</sup> The only other similar material ascribed to him survives in six manuscripts and is edited below.

Originally it was thought that this material was two separate treatises: *De duplici signorum ortu vel occasu* and *De quinque circulis mundi*<sup>2</sup> — the first ascribed to Abbo in only one manuscript (B), where it follows directly on from the two previously edited items, and the other noted as 'Idem' (all manuscripts). However, the second item consists of seven lines from Virgil's *Georgics* and an excerpt from the commentary of Servius; since the first text ends with a quotation from Virgil, 'Idem' probably refers to Virgil and thus all the material forms one treatise.

The *De duplici signorum ortu vel occasu* describes a trivial astronomical phenomenon (the 'double rising and setting' of stars and planets) which involves heavenly objects near the sun in the sky. These objects sometime sappear both in the evening sky as the sun sets, and again in the morning sky as the sun rises. During full daylight, of course, they are obscured by the sun's brilliance.

The 'De quinque circulis', consisting of the passages from Virgil and Servius, describes the five zones of the heavens (*Georgics* 1.233-239).<sup>3</sup>

As noted in my earlier article, Abbo's astronomical treatises originally circulated as part of a 'cosmographical anthology' in support of Carolingian computus handbooks and thus served as background material to the study and use of the more significant computus material.<sup>4</sup> (Hence the inclusion of the passages from

<sup>1</sup> Ron B. Thomson, 'Two Astronomical Tractates of Abbo of Fleury' in *The Light of Nature*, ed. J. D. North and J. J. Roche (Dordrecht, 1985), pp. 113-33.

<sup>2</sup> A. van der Vyver, 'Les œuvres inédites d'Abbon de Fleury', *Revue bénédictine* 47 (1935) 140.

<sup>3</sup> G. Thilo, ed., *Servii grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii Bucolica et Georgica commentarii* (Leipzig, 1887; rpt. Hildesheim, 1961), in *Georg.* 1.235 (ll. 9-17).

<sup>4</sup> Thomson, 'Two Astronomical Tractates', 115-16.

Virgil and Servius.) Five manuscripts (of the six) are of English origin; this reinforces the contention that the astronomical material was written while Abbo was visiting England (985 or 986) during which time he shared his teaching experience with English schoolmasters in an attempt to improve the monastic schools in that country.<sup>5</sup> It would not be unreasonable for him to supply the type of astronomical information found in all these various treatises; and therefore these items might circulate mainly, if not exclusively, in England.

#### THE MANUSCRIPTS AND THE EDITION

I have found eighteen manuscripts of the *Sententia Abbonis de ratione spere*. Of these five continue with the *De duplici signorum ortu vel occasu*; four of the five also have the 'De quinque circulis'. One other manuscript (T), without the *Sententia*, also contains the *De duplici signorum ortu vel occasu* only. I retain the sigla used in editing the *Sententia*.

- S = Cambridge, St. John's College I.15 (James 221), pp. 290b-291b; twelfth century.<sup>6</sup>
- B = Cambridge, Trinity College R.15.32 (James 945), fol. 7r; English (Winchester?), early eleventh century.<sup>7</sup>
- C = Durham, Cathedral Library Hunter 100, fol. 68r-v (olim 85r-v); English (Durham), 1100-35.<sup>8</sup>
- D = Glasgow, University Library Hunter 85 (olim T.4.2), fols. 118v-119r (olim 97v-98r); English (Durham Priory), twelfth century.<sup>9</sup>
- G = London, British Library Cotton Vitellius A.xii, fol. 64v (or 61v); English (Exeter?), eleventh century.<sup>10</sup>
- T = Vatican Library, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Reg. lat. 596, fol. 22va-b (olim 13va-b), eleventh century.

All manuscripts were collated. Medieval spellings have been retained but punctuation and capitalization have been modernized. The few Greek words in the text have been reported in lower case characters. Significant variants have been noted together with a few orthographical variants of interest.

<sup>5</sup> *ibid.*, 116.

<sup>6</sup> M. R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of St. John's College, Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1913), pp. 253-56.

<sup>7</sup> M. R. James, *The Western Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge. A Descriptive Catalogue 2* (Cambridge, 1901), p. 363.

<sup>8</sup> Fritz Saxl, Hans Meier and Harry Bober, *Verzeichnis astrologischer und mythologischer illustrierter Handschriften des lateinischen Mittelalters / Catalogue of Astrological and Mythological Illustrated Manuscripts of the Latin Middle Ages 3.1* (London, 1953), pp. 441-47.

<sup>9</sup> See John Young and P. H. Aitken, *A Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Library of the Hunterian Museum in the University of Glasgow* (Glasgow, 1908), pp. 91-94.

<sup>10</sup> N. R. Ker, 'Two Notes on ms. Ashmole 328', *Medium Ævum* 4 (1935) 18.

## ABBO DE DUPLICI SIGNORUM ORTU VEL OCCASU

De duplici ortu signorum dubitantes aliquando hac ratione conveni, quia sol singulis horis momentisque se paulatim promovendo ad sequentia transit signa, nec unquam ex eadem parte caeli sequenti die surgit unde pridie surrexerat; idcirco  
 5 quaedam stellae hodie parent quae heri vicinitate eiusdem solis latuerant, et post paululum eius claritate latent; itaque fit ut ipse ortus stellae terminet noctem et inchoet diem. Ex ipsa etiam solis promotione contingit respicientibus ad occasum ut stella aliqua quae sero paruerat, hac nocte iam solis lumine comprehensa, videri nequeat. Quare fit ut post diurnam lucem in occidente exorta stella terminet diem  
 10 et inchoet noctem. Cumque ex tali mutua vicissitudine quaedam stellae oriantur, quaedam occidunt, certum est quod duplex sit earum ortus, duplexque occasus. Quia et vesperi orta statim cum mundo occulitur, et altera matutinali ex ortu gratissima, parvo interstitio solaris luminis amplitudine occupatur. Vocaturque serotinus ortus vel occasus a Grecis κοσμικός, id est mundanus, matutinus  
 15 ἡλιακός, id est solaris. De solari Virgilius nullius disciplinae expers inquit: ‘Ante tibi Eoae Athlantides abscondantur.’ Pliades enim in cauda Tauri quas Athlantides vocat. Matutino ex ortu hiemalem horrorem, vespertino vernalem adducunt temperiem.

## IDEM DE QUINQUE CIRCULIS MUNDI:

20 Quinque tenent caelum zonae: quarum una corusco  
 semper sole rubens et torrida semper ab igni;  
 quam circum extremae dextra laevaue trahuntur  
 caeruleae, glacie concretae atque imbribus atris;  
 has inter mediamque duae mortalibus aegris  
 25 munere concessae divom, et via secta per ambas,  
 obliquus qua se signorum verteret ordo.

Bene addidit ‘extremae’ ne eas quae circa igneam sunt intellegeremus, quas constat esse temperatas ex vicinitate caloris et frigoris: quarum unam nos inhabitamus, alteram antipodes. Terra enim undique caelo et aere cingitur. Sed per has duas  
 30 zonas in obliquum tenditur signifer circulus, qui cursum solis continet: unde etiam fit ut duae zonae frigidissimae sint, ad quas sol numquam accedit.

14-15 Servius, *Comm. in Verg. Georg.* 1.218 (l. 26). 15-16 Virgil, *Georgics* 1.221.  
 20-26 Virgil, *Georgics* 1.233-239. 27-31 Servius, *Comm. in Verg. Georg.* 1.235 (ll. 9-17).

1 Abbo ... occasu *om.* CDGST 2 dubitantes] ita conveni *add. T* 8 videri] vidi *T*  
 13 interstitio] interstiti CDGS 14 κοσμικός] ΚΟCΜΙΚΟC BCDGST ΚΟCΜΙΚΟC ...  
 matutinus *in marg. T* 15 ἡλιακός] ΕΛΙΑΚΟC T: ΕΛΙΚΟC BCG: eaikoc DS id est *om.*  
*T* 16 Athlantides<sup>12]</sup> Adhlantides BGT 18 post temperiem *des. T* 19 quinque] .v.  
 CDGS 25 divom] divum B 26 ordo] scilicet per illam viam curruntur .xii. (.xii. curr[un]tur  
*G*) signa *add. s.s. BG* 28 vicinitate] vicissitudine CDGS quarum] una D 29 alteram  
*add. s.s. D* Sed] scilicet et S



PUBLICATIONS  
OF THE  
PONTIFICAL INSTITUTE OF MEDIAEVAL STUDIES

ISBN Prefix: 0-88844-

Series Codes

EGS	The Etienne Gilson Series	PMS	Papers in Mediaeval Studies
MST	Mediaeval Sources in Translation	SM	Subsidia Mediaevalia
PDOE	Publications of the Dictionary of Old English	ST	Studies and Texts
	TMLT		Toronto Medieval Latin Texts

New Publications

- A Durham Book of Devotions.** Edited by Thomas H. Bestul. TMLT 18. 1987; viii, 102 pp. ISBN -468-0.  
Devotional Literature \$ 4.75
- Master Gregorius. The Marvels of Rome.** Translated by John Osborne. MST 31. 1987; viii, 114 pp. ISBN -281-5.  
Travel \$ 7.50
- Herebert, William. The Works of William Herebert, O.F.M.** Edited by Stephen R. Reimer. ST 81. 1987; x, 173 pp.; plate. ISBN -081-2.  
Sermons; Lyrics \$18.00
- Herren, Michael W., ed. The Hisperica Famina: II. Related Poems.** A critical edition with English translation and philological commentary. ST 85. 1987; xvi, 226 pp. ISBN -085-5.  
Literature \$24.00
- Stanley, Eric Gerald. A Collection of Papers with Emphasis on Old English Literature.** PDOE 3. 1987; xviii, 461 pp. ISBN -903-8.  
Old English Literature \$35.00
- Thomas Aquinas. Faith, Reason and Theology.** Translated with introduction and notes by Armand Maurer. MST 32. 1987; xxxviii, 127 pp. ISBN -282-3.  
Theology \$ 6.50

Previously Published

**MEDIAEVAL STUDIES**

Volumes 1-40 (1939-1978)	per volume \$ 20.00
Volumes 41-49 (1979-1987)	per volume \$ 30.00

# PUBLICATIONS OF THE

Volumes 1-49 (1939-1987)	set	\$700.00
Volume 50 (1988)	\$	30.00
General Index, volumes 1-25 (1939-1963). ISBN -625-X.	\$	11.00
First Supplement Index, volumes 26-30 (1964-1968). ISBN -631-4.	\$	3.00
Second Supplement Index, volumes 31-40 (1969-1978). ISBN -684-9.	\$	12.00

## STUDIES AND TEXTS

- Adelard of Bath. **The First Latin Translation of Euclid's *Elements* Commonly Ascribed to Adelard of Bath.** Edited by H. L. L. Busard. ST 64. 1983; vi, 425 pp. ISBN -064-2.  
Mathematics \$37.00
- Pseudo-André de Crète. **Un éloge de Jacques, le frère du Seigneur.** Ed. Jacques Noret. ST 44. 1978; 113 pp. ISBN -044-8.  
Theology \$11.50
- Bailey, Terence. **The Intonation Formulas of Western Chant.** ST 28. 1974; viii, 101 pp. ISBN -028-6.  
Music: Church \$11.00
- Bailey, Terence. **The Processions of Sarum and the Western Church.** ST 21. 1971; xvi, 208 pp. ISBN -021-9.  
Music: Church \$22.00
- Bernard of Trilia. **Quaestiones de cognitione animae separatae a corpore.** Ed. Stuart Martin. ST 11. 1965; x, 427 pp. ISBN -011-1.  
Philosophy \$35.00
- Blumenthal, Uta-Renate. **The Early Councils of Pope Paschal II, 1100-1110.** ST 43. 1978; xiv, 173 pp. ISBN -043-X.  
History: Papacy \$18.50
- Boulton, Maureen Barry McCann. **The Old French *Evangile de l'Enfance*.** An edition with introduction and notes. ST 70. 1984; x, 117 pp. ISBN -070-7. \$13.00
- Brett, Edward T. **Humbert of Romans. His Life and Views of Thirteenth-Century Society.** ST 67. 1984; xii, 220 pp. ISBN -067-7.  
History / Biography \$22.00
- Brown, Oscar James. **Natural Rectitude and Divine Law in Aquinas.** ST 55. 1981; xiv, 210 pp. ISBN -055-3.  
Philosophy / Theology \$15.50
- Capgrave, John. **The Life of St. Norbert by John Capgrave, O.E.S.A. (1393-1464).** Ed. Cyril L. Smetana. ST 40. 1977; x, 179 pp. ISBN -040-5.  
History: Saints \$18.50
- Clarembald of Arras. **Life and Works of Clarembald of Arras, a Twelfth-Century Master of the School of Chartres.** Ed. Nikolaus M. Häring. ST 10. 1965; xvi, 276 pp. ISBN -010-3.  
Philosophy / Theology \$29.00

PONTIFICAL INSTITUTE OF MEDIAEVAL STUDIES

- Demaitre, Luke. **Doctor Bernard de Gordon: Professor and Practitioner**. ST 51. 1980; xii, 236 pp. ISBN -051-0.  
Medicine \$18.00
- DeWindt, Anne Reiber and Edwin Brezette DeWindt. **Royal Justice and the Medieval English Countryside**. The Huntingdonshire Eyre of 1286, the Ramsey Abbey Banlieu Court of 1287, and the Assizes of 1287-88. ST 57. 1981; 2 parts: xvi, viii, 766 pp. ISBN -057-X.  
History: Legal and Social \$55.00
- DeWindt, Edwin Brezette. **Land and People in Holywell-cum-Needingworth: Structures of Tenure and Patterns of Social Organization in an East Midlands Village, 1252-1457**. ST 22. 1972; vi, 299 pp. ISBN -022-7.  
History: Social \$30.00
- Dimnik, Martin. **Mikhail, Prince of Chernigov and Grand Prince of Kiev, 1224-1246**. ST 52. 1981; xvi, 199 pp. ISBN -052-9.  
History—Russia \$14.00
- Donkin, R. A. **The Cistercians: Studies in the Geography of Medieval England and Wales**. ST 38. 1978; 242 pp. ISBN -038-3.  
History / Monasticism \$24.00
- Fedwick, Paul J. **The Church and the Charisma of Leadership in Basil of Caesarea**. ST 45. 1979; xviii, 225 pp. ISBN -045-6.  
Patristics: St. Basil \$15.00
- Ford, Alvin E., ed. **La Vengeance de Nostre-Seigneur. The Old and Middle French Prose Versions. The Version of Japheth**. ST 63. 1984; viii, 232 pp. ISBN -063-4.  
French Literature \$22.00
- Gerhoch of Reichersberg. **Letter to Pope Hadrian about the Novelties of the Day**. Ed. Nikolaus M. Häring. ST 24. 1974; 125 pp. ISBN -024-3.  
Philosophy / Theology \$12.50
- Gervers, Michael. **The Hospitaller Cartulary in the British Library (Cotton MS Nero E VI)**. A Study of the Manuscript and Its Composition, with a Critical Edition of Two Fragments of Earlier Cartularies for Essex. ST 50. 1981; xxii, 386 pp. ISBN -050-2.  
Archives / Codicology \$29.00
- Gilbert of Poitiers. **The Commentaries on Boethius**. Ed. Nikolaus M. Häring. ST 13. 1966; xvi, 437 pp. ISBN -013-8.  
Philosophy / Theology \$35.00
- Gough, Mary, ed. **Alahan. An Early Christian Monastery in Southern Turkey**. ST 73. 1985; xviii, 235 pp.; figures, maps, plates. ISBN -073-1.  
Archaeology / Architecture \$22.50
- Guilhem de Montanhagol. **Les Poésies de Guilhem de Montanhagol, troubadour provençal du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle**. Ed. Peter T. Ricketts. ST 9. 1964; 175 pp. ISBN -009-X.  
Provençal Literature \$17.50
- Guillaume de Pierre Godin. **The Theory of Papal Monarchy in the Fourteenth Century: *Tractatus de causa immediata ecclesiastice potestatis***. Edited by Wm. D. McCready. ST 56. 1982; xxiv, 397 pp. ISBN -056-1.  
History: Ecclesiastical \$33.00

PUBLICATIONS OF THE

- Haines, Roy Martin. **Archbishop John Stratford. Political Revolutionary and Champion of the Liberties of the English Church, ca. 1275/80-1348.** ST 76. 1986; xviii, 587 pp. ISBN -076-6.  
History: Ecclesiastical \$45.00
- Herren, Michael W., ed. **The Hisperica Famina: I. The A-Text.** ST 31. 1974; viii, 234 pp. ISBN -031-6.  
Literature / Education \$24.00
- Hindman, Sandra L. **Christine de Pizan's 'Epistre Othéa'. Painting and Politics at the Court of Charles VI.** ST 77. 1986; xxiv, 229 pp.; 98 plates. ISBN -077-4.  
Art History / Political Science \$35.50
- Holcot, Robert, OP. **Exploring the Boundaries of Reason. Three Questions on the Nature of God.** Edited by Hester G. Gelber. ST 62. 1983; viii, 139 pp. ISBN -062-6.  
Theology / Logic \$16.00
- Joachim of Fiore. **Enchiridion super Apocalypsim.** Edited by Edward K. Burger. ST 78. 1986; x, 114 pp. ISBN -078-2.  
Theology \$12.50
- Jordanus de Nemore. **Jordanus de Nemore and the Mathematics of Astrolabes: *De plana spera*.** Ed. Ron B. Thomson. ST 39. 1978; x, 238 pp. ISBN -039-1.  
Science: Astronomy \$25.00
- Julian of Norwich. **A Book of Showings to the anchoress Julian of Norwich.** Ed. Edmund Colledge and James Walsh. ST 35. 1978; 2 parts: viii, vi, 789 pp. ISBN -035-9.  
Spirituality / Middle English \$55.00
- Langland, William. **Piers Plowman: The Z Version.** Edited by A. G. Rigg and Charlotte Brewer. ST 59. 1983; x, 137 pp. ISBN -059-6.  
Middle English \$11.00
- Ledrede, Richard. **The Latin Poems of Richard Ledrede, O.F.M., Bishop of Ossory, 1317-1360.** Ed. Edmund Colledge from the Red Book of Ossory. ST 30. 1974; lx, 164 pp. ISBN -030-8.  
Latin Poetry \$22.00
- Logan, F. Donald. **Excommunication and the Secular Arm in Medieval England: A Study in Legal Procedure from the Thirteenth to the Sixteenth Century.** ST 15. 1968; 239 pp. ISBN -015-4.  
Law--England \$24.00
- Machado, Francisco. **The Mirror of the New Christians (*Espelho de Christãos Novos*).** Ed. Frank E. Talmage and Mildred Evelyn Vieira. ST 36. 1977; 344 pp. ISBN -036-7.  
Theology / Old Portuguese \$34.50
- Mechtild of Hackeborn. **The Booke of Gostlye Grace.** Ed. Theresa A. Halligan. ST 46. 1979; viii, 142 pp., 7 fiches. ISBN -046-4.  
Spirituality / Middle English \$10.00
- Moore, Ellen W. **The Fairs of Medieval England.** An introductory study. ST 72. 1985; xii, 401 pp.; maps, plate. ISBN -072-3.  
Economic History: Fairs \$34.00

PONTIFICAL INSTITUTE OF MEDIAEVAL STUDIES

- Mundy, John Hine. **The Repression of Catharism at Toulouse. The Royal Diploma of 1279.** ST 74. 1985; xiv, 336 pp.; maps, plates. ISBN -074-X.  
History: Social/Ecclesiastical \$28.00
- Murray, Alexander C. **Germanic Kinship Structure. Studies in Law and Society in Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages.** ST 65. 1983; xii, 256 pp. ISBN -065-0.  
History \$21.00
- O'Donnell, J. Reginald, ed. **Nine Mediaeval Thinkers: A Collection of Hitherto Unedited Texts.** ST 1. 1955; xii, 382 pp. ISBN -001-4.  
Philosophy \$39.00
- Oresme, Nicole. **Nicole Oresme and the Marvels of Nature: The *De causis mirabilium*.** Edited by Bert Hansen. ST 68. 1985; xii, 478 pp. ISBN -068-5.  
History of Science \$39.00
- Parsons, John Carmi. **The Court and Household of Eleanor of Castile in 1290.** ST 37. 1977; xii, 178 pp. ISBN -037-5.  
History—England \$19.00
- Petersen, Joan M. **The Dialogues of Gregory the Great in their Late Antique Cultural Background.** ST 69. 1984; xxiv, 227 pp. ISBN -069-3.  
History: Ecclesiastical \$23.00
- Principe, Walter H. **Alexander of Hales' Theology of the Hypostatic Union. The Theology of the Hypostatic Union in the Early Thirteenth Century, 2.** ST 12. 1967; 254 pp. ISBN -012-X.  
Theology \$25.00
- Principe, Walter H. **Hugh of Saint-Cher's Theology of the Hypostatic Union. The Theology of the Hypostatic Union in the Early Thirteenth Century, 3.** ST 19. 1970; 265 pp. ISBN -019-7.  
Theology \$25.00
- Principe, Walter H. **Philip the Chancellor's Theology of the Hypostatic Union. The Theology of the Hypostatic Union in the Early Thirteenth Century, 4.** ST 32. 1975; 234 pp. ISBN -032-4.  
Theology \$25.00
- Principe, Walter H. **William of Auxerre's Theology of the Hypostatic Union. The Theology of the Hypostatic Union in the Early Thirteenth Century, 1.** ST 7. 1963; 332 pp. ISBN -007-3.  
Theology \$25.00
- Pryor, John H. **Business Contracts of Medieval Provence. Selected *Notulae* from the Cartulary of Giraud Amalric of Marseilles, 1248.** ST 54. 1981; xiv, 311 pp. ISBN -054-5.  
Commercial History / Law \$24.00
- Quinn, John Francis. **The Historical Constitution of St. Bonaventure's Philosophy.** ST 23. 1973; 981 pp. ISBN -023-5.  
Philosophy \$55.00
- Raftis, J. Ambrose. **The Estates of Ramsey Abbey: A Study in Economic Growth and Organization.** With a preface by M. M. Postan. ST 3. 1957; xx, 341 pp. ISBN -003-0.  
History: Social \$35.00



PUBLICATIONS OF THE

- Raftis, J. Ambrose. **A Small Town in Late Medieval England: Godmanchester 1278-1400.** ST 53. 1982; xii, 480 pp. ISBN -053-7.  
History: Social \$34.00
- Raftis, J. Ambrose. **Tenure and Mobility: Studies in the Social History of the Mediaeval English Village.** ST 8. 1964; 309 pp.  
ISBN -008-1 paperback \$25.00  
History: Social ISBN -554-7 microfiche \$ 4.00
- Raftis, J. Ambrose. **Warboys: Two Hundred Years in the Life of an English Mediaeval Village.** ST 29. 1974; x, 267 pp. ISBN -029-4.  
History: Social \$27.50
- Reyerson, Kathryn L. **Business, Banking and Finance in Medieval Montpellier.** ST 75. 1985; xvi, 184 pp. ISBN -075-8.  
History: Economic \$19.50
- Richard of Campsall. **Works.** Edited by Edward A. Synan.  
Volume 1. **Questiones super librum Priorum analeticorum.** ST 17. 1968; 326 pp. ISBN -017-0. \$32.50  
Volume 2. **Minor Treatises; Logica Campsale Anglici.** ST 58. 1982; viii, 450 pp. ISBN -058-8. \$32.50  
Logic
- Rigg, A. G., ed. and trans. **Gawain on Marriage. The Textual Tradition of the *De coniuge non ducenda*.** ST 79. 1986; xii, 104 pp. ISBN -079-0.  
Poetry \$12.00
- Robert of Flamborough, Canon-Penitentiary of Saint-Victor at Paris. **Liber poenitentialis.** Ed. J. J. Francis Firth. ST 18. 1971; xxx, 364 pp. ISBN -018-9.  
Theology \$39.00
- Roberts, Phyllis Barzillay. **Stephanus de Lingua-Tonante: Studies in the Sermons of Stephen Langton.** ST 16. 1968; xii, 271 pp. ISBN -016-2.  
Theology / Preaching \$28.00
- Rorem, Paul. **Biblical and Liturgical Symbols within the Pseudo-Dionysian Synthesis.** ST 71. 1984; xii, 177 pp. ISBN -071-5.  
Theology \$17.50
- Rudel, Jaufre. **The Songs of Jaufre Rudel.** Ed. Rupert T. Pickens. ST 41. 1978; viii, 281 pp. ISBN -041-3.  
Provençal Literature \$29.00
- Searle, Eleanor. **Lordship and Community: Battle Abbey and Its Banlieu, 1066-1538.** ST 26. 1974; 479 pp. ISBN -026-X.  
History: Social \$45.00
- Sedulius Scottus. **Commentum in Maiorem Donatum Grammaticum.** Ed. Denis Brearley. ST 27. 1975; 300 pp. ISBN -027-8.  
Grammar \$30.00
- Simon of Faversham. **Quaestiones super libro Elenchorum.** Edited by Sten Ebbesen, Thomas Izbicki, John Longeway, Francesco del Punta, Eileen Serene, and Eleonore Stump. ST 60. 1984; xiv, 270 pp. ISBN -060-X.  
Logic / Linguistics \$31.00

- Tanner, Norman P. **The Church in Late Medieval Norwich, 1370-1532.** ST 66. 1984; xviii, 279 pp. ISBN -066-9.  
History: Ecclesiastical \$25.00
- Thierry of Chartres. **Commentaries on Boethius by Thierry of Chartres and His School.** Ed. Nikolaus M. Häring. ST 20. 1971; 619 pp. ISBN -020-0.  
Philosophy / Theology \$52.00
- Thomas Aquinas, St. **Quaestiones de anima.** Ed. James H. Robb. ST 14. 1968; 282 pp. ISBN -014-6.  
Philosophy / Theology \$28.00
- Thomson, Willliell. **Friars in the Cathedral: The First Franciscan Bishops, 1226-1261.** ST 33. 1975; 320 pp. ISBN -033-2.  
History: Ecclesiastical \$32.00
- Thurston, Ethel. **The Music in the St. Victor Manuscript, Paris lat. 15139: Polyphony of the Thirteenth Century.** Introduction and facsimiles. ST 5. 1959; iv, 46 pp. ISBN -005-7.  
Music \$15.00
- Walter of Wimborne. **The Poems of Walter of Wimborne.** Ed. A. G. Rigg. ST 42. 1978; xii, 349 pp. ISBN -042-1.  
Latin Poetry \$36.00
- Weisheipl, James A., ed. **Albertus Magnus and the Sciences: Commemorative Essays, 1980.** ST 49. 1980; xiv, 658 pp. ISBN -049-9.  
Science \$35.00
- Westra, Haijo Jan. **The Commentary on Martianus Capella's *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii* Attributed to Bernardus Silvestris.** ST 80. 1986; xii, 290 pp. ISBN -080-4.  
Philosophy \$30.00
- Wieland, Gernot R. **The Latin Glosses on Arator and Prudentius in Cambridge University Library, MS Gg.5.35.** ST 61. 1983; x, 286 pp. ISBN -061-8.  
Latin Language \$23.50
- William of Auvergne. **De Trinitate.** Ed. Bruno Switalski. ST 34. 1976; xiv, 269 pp. ISBN -034-0.  
Theology \$28.00
- Wright, J. Robert. **The Church and the English Crown, 1305-1334.** A study based on the Register of Archbishop Walter Reynolds. ST 48. 1980; xx, 472 pp. ISBN -048-0.  
History: Ecclesiastical \$27.00

#### SUBSIDIA MEDIAEVALIA

- Ashworth, E. J. **The Tradition of Medieval Logic and Speculative Grammar from Anselm to the End of the Seventeenth Century.** A Bibliography from 1836 onwards. SM 9. 1978; x, 111 pp. ISBN -358-7.  
Grammar / Logic \$13.00
- Berkhout, Carl T. and Jeffrey B. Russell. **Medieval Heresies: A Bibliography 1960-1979.** SM 11. 1981; xvi, 201 pp. ISBN -360-9.  
History / Heresy \$17.50

# PUBLICATIONS OF THE

- Boyle, Leonard E. **A Survey of the Vatican Archives and of Its Medieval Holdings.** SM 1. 1972; 250 pp. ISBN -350-1.  
Archives—Vatican \$15.00
- DeWindt, Edwin Brezette. **The *Liber Gersumarum* of Ramsey Abbey.** A Calendar and Index. SM 7. 1976; viii, 455 pp. ISBN -356-0.  
History: Social \$45.00
- Farge, James K. **Biographical Register of Paris Doctors of Theology, 1500-1536.** With a preface by Jean-Claude Margolin. SM 10. 1980; xvi, 562 pp. ISBN -359-5.  
History: Theological \$35.00
- Hassell, James Woodrow, Jr. **Middle French Proverbs, Sentences and Proverbial Phrases.** SM 12. 1982; viii, 275 pp. ISBN -361-7.  
Proverbs: French \$19.50
- Hillgarth, J. N. and Giulio Silano. **The Register *Notule communium* 14 of the Diocese of Barcelona (1345-1348).** A calendar with selected documents. SM 13. 1983; x, 365 pp. ISBN -362-5.  
History: Ecclesiastical \$30.00
- Jolliffe, P. S. **A Check-List of Middle English Prose Writings of Spiritual Guidance.** SM 2. 1974; 253 pp. ISBN -351-X.  
Middle English / Spirituality \$25.00
- Lindberg, David C. **A Catalogue of Medieval and Renaissance Optical Manuscripts.** SM 4. 1975; 142 pp. ISBN -353-6.  
Science / Manuscripts \$14.00
- Raftis, J. Ambrose. **Assart Data and Land Values: Two Studies in the East Midlands 1200-1350.** SM 3. 1974; 169 pp. ISBN -352-8.  
History: Social \$17.00
- Raftis, J. Ambrose and Mary Patricia Hogan. **Early Huntingdonshire Lay Subsidy Rolls.** SM 8. 1976; 301 pp. ISBN -357-9.  
History: Social \$28.00
- Smith, Waldo E. L. **The Register of Richard Clifford, Bishop of Worcester 1401-1407.** A Calendar. SM 6. 1976; 235 pp. ISBN -355-2.  
History: Ecclesiastical \$23.50
- Spade, Paul Vincent. **The Mediaeval Liar: A Catalogue of the *Insolubilia*-Literature.** SM 5. 1975; 137 pp. ISBN -354-4.  
Logic / Manuscripts \$14.00
- Thomson, Williell R. **The Latin Writings of John Wyclyf.** An Annotated Catalog. SM 14. 1983; xxii, 352 pp. ISBN -363-3.  
Theology \$30.00

## MEDIAEVAL SOURCES IN TRANSLATION

- Abelard, Peter. **The Story of Abelard's Adversities.** A translation with notes by J. T. Muckle of the *Historia calamitatum*. MST 4. 1964; 80 pp. ISBN -253-X.  
Philosophy / History \$ 4.00

PONTIFICAL INSTITUTE OF MEDIAEVAL STUDIES

- Abelard, Peter. **A Dialogue of a Philosopher with a Jew, and a Christian.** Translated by Pierre J. Payer. MST 20. 1979; viii, 187 pp. ISBN -269-6.  
Philosophy / Theology \$ 5.00
- Alan of Lille. **Anticlaudianus or The Good and Perfect Man.** Translation and commentary by James J. Sheridan. MST 14. 1973; 251 pp. ISBN -263-7.  
Literature \$10.00
- Alan of Lille. **The Plaint of Nature.** Translation and commentary by James J. Sheridan. MST 26. 1980; viii, 256 pp. ISBN -275-0.  
Literature \$10.00
- Boethius of Dacia. **On the Supreme Good. On the Eternity of the World. On Dreams.** Translated by John F. Wippel. MST 30. 1987; vi, 89 pp. ISBN -280-7.  
Theology \$ 5.75
- The Collection in Seventy-Four Titles: A Canon Law Manual of the Gregorian Reform.** Translated and annotated by John Gilchrist. MST 22. 1980; xiv, 288 pp. ISBN -271-8.  
Law: Canon \$18.00
- Master Eckhart. **Parisian Questions and Prologues.** Translated with an introduction and notes by Armand A. Maurer. MST 15. 1974; 123 pp. ISBN -264-5.  
Philosophy / Theology \$ 6.00
- The Fleury Play of Herod.** Edited by Terence Bailey. MST 5. 1965; 72 pp. ISBN -254-8.  
Drama \$ 4.00
- Geoffrey of Vinsauf. **Poetria Nova.** Translated by Margaret F. Nims. MST 6. 1967; 110 pp. ISBN -255-6.  
Rhetoric \$ 4.00
- Gersonides. **The Wars of the Lord, Treatise Three: On God's Knowledge.** A translation and commentary by Norbert Max Samuelson. MST 19. 1977; xii, 323 pp. ISBN -268-8.  
Philosophy / Judaism \$23.00
- Godfrey of Saint Victor. **The Fountain of Philosophy.** A translation by Edward A. Synan of the twelfth-century *Fons philosophiae*. MST 10. 1972; 89 pp. ISBN -259-9.  
Philosophy \$ 4.00
- Heytesbury, William. **On "Insoluble" Sentences.** Chapter One of his *Rules for Solving Sophisms*. Translated with an introduction and study by Paul Vincent Spade. MST 21. 1979; viii, 111 pp. ISBN -270-X.  
Logic \$ 5.00
- Ibn Sīnā. **Remarks and Admonitions, Part One: Logic.** Translated by Shams C. Inati. MST 28. 1984; xiv, 165 pp. ISBN -277-7.  
Logic \$ 9.50
- John of Paris. **On Royal and Papal Power.** Translated with an introduction by J. A. Watt. MST 9. 1971; 261 pp. ISBN -258-0.  
Political Science / Papacy \$ 8.00
- Karlamagnús Saga: The Saga of Charlemagne and His Heroes.** Translated by Constance B. Heatt. 1 (Parts I-III). MST 13. 1975; 346 pp. ISBN -262-9. \$15.00

PUBLICATIONS OF THE

- 2 (Part IV). MST 17. 1975; 443 pp. ISBN -266-1. \$15.00  
 3 (Parts V-X). MST 25. 1980; xii, 368 pp. ISBN -274-2. \$15.00  
 Charlemagne: Romances
- Kimhi, Joseph. **The Book of the Covenant**. Translated by Frank Talmage. MST 12. 1972; 88 pp. ISBN -261-0. \$ 4.00  
 Judaism
- The Life of Cola Di Rienzo**. Translated with an introduction by John Wright. MST 18. 1975; 166 pp. ISBN -267-X. \$ 8.50  
 History: Rome
- Pedro Alfonso. **The Scholar's Guide**. A translation by Joseph R. Jones and John E. Keller of the twelfth-century *Disciplina clericalis*. MST 8. 1969; 117 pp. ISBN -257-2. \$ 5.00  
 Literature / Morals
- Pere III. **Chronicle**. Translated by Mary Hillgarth; notes by J. N. Hillgarth. MST 23 and 24. 1980; 2 parts: xviii, vi, 668 pp. ISBN -272-6. set \$35.00  
 History: Spain
- Petrarch. **Book without a Name**. A translation by Norman P. Zacour of the *Liber sine nomine*. MST 11. 1973; 128 pp. ISBN -260-2. \$ 5.00  
 Papacy / History
- The Play of Antichrist**. Translated with an introduction by John Wright. MST 7. 1967; 118 pp. ISBN -256-4. \$ 4.00  
 Drama
- Porphyry the Phoenician. **Isagoge**. Translation, introduction and notes by Edward W. Warren. MST 16. 1975; 65 pp. ISBN -265-3. \$ 4.50  
 Logic
- Thomas Aquinas. **The Division and Methods of the Sciences**. Translated with introduction and notes by Armand Maurer. 4th revised edition. MST 3. 1986; xlii, 119 pp. ISBN -279-3. \$ 6.50  
 Philosophy
- Thomas Aquinas, St. **On Being and Essence**. Translated with an introduction and notes by Armand Maurer. Second revised edition. MST 1. 1968; 79 pp. ISBN -250-5. \$ 4.00  
 Philosophy
- Thomas Aquinas, St. **On Kingship to the King of Cyprus**. Translated by Gerald B. Phelan; revised with an introduction and notes by I. Th. Eschmann. MST 2. 1949; xl, 119 pp. ISBN -251-3. \$ 4.00  
 Political Science / Philosophy
- Thomas Aquinas, St. **Quodlibetal Questions 1 and 2**. Translated by Sandra Edwards. MST 27. 1983; viii, 128 pp. ISBN -276-9. \$ 7.50  
 Philosophy
- Walter of Châtillon. **The Alexandreis**. Translated by R. Telfryn Pritchard. MST 29. 1986; xii, 255 pp. ISBN -278-5. \$13.50  
 Epic Poetry

**THE ETIENNE GILSON SERIES**

- Maurer, Armand A. **Medieval Philosophy**. Second edition with additions, corrections and a bibliographic supplement. With a preface by Etienne Gilson. EGS 4. 1982; xxii, 455 pp. ISBN -704-3.  
Philosophy \$19.95
- McGrath, Margaret. **Etienne Gilson: A Bibliography / Une Bibliographie**. EGS 3. 1982; xxviii, 124 pp. ISBN -703-5.  
Philosophy / Bibliography \$14.00
- Owens, Joseph. **Towards a Philosophy of Medieval Studies**. EGS 9. 1986; ii, 22 pp. ISBN -709-4.  
Philosophy available on request
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. **The Spirit of Medieval Theology**. EGS 8. 1985; ii, 16 pp. ISBN -708-6.  
Theology available on request
- Schmitz, Kenneth L. **What Has Clio to Do with Athena? Etienne Gilson: Historian and Philosopher**. EGS 10. 1987; 24 pp. ISBN -710-8.  
History / Philosophy available on request
- Shook, Laurence K. **Etienne Gilson**. EGS 6. 1984; x, 412 pp., plates. ISBN -706-X.  
Biography \$25.00

**PAPERS IN MEDIAEVAL STUDIES**

- Archéologie du signe**. Edited by Lucie Brind'Amour and Eugene Vance. PMS 3. 1983; xii, 369 pp. ISBN -803-1.  
Semiotics \$27.00
- Graceful Reason. Essays in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy in Honour of Joseph Owens, CSSR**. Edited by Lloyd P. Gerson. PMS 4. 1983; xiv, 447 pp. ISBN -804-X.  
Philosophy \$38.50
- Insular Latin Studies: Latin Texts and Manuscripts of the British Isles 550-1066**. Edited by Michael W. Herren. PMS 1. 1981; xiv, 226 pp. ISBN -801-5.  
Latin Texts / Manuscripts \$15.00
- Logos Islamikos. Studia Islamica in Honorem Georgii Michaelis Wickens**. Edited by Roger M. Savory and Dionisius A. Agius. PMS 6. 1984; x, 351 pp., plate. ISBN -806-6.  
Islamic Studies \$32.00
- The Rise of British Logic**. Acts of the Sixth European Symposium on Medieval Logic and Semantics (Oxford, 1983). Edited by P. Osmund Lewry, OP. PMS 7. 1985; xii, 421 pp. ISBN -807-4.  
Logic \$34.50
- Sources in Social History: Private Acts of the Late Middle Ages**. Edited by Paolo Brezzi and Egmont Lee. PMS 5. 1984; xxvi, 328 pp., plates. ISBN -805-8.  
History: Social \$28.00

# PUBLICATIONS OF THE

## EDITIONS, ESSAYS AND MONOGRAPHS

- Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic. A Sixteen-Hundredth Anniversary Symposium.** Edited by Paul J. Fedwick. 1981; 2 parts: xlv, viii, 764 pp. ISBN -412-5.  
 Patristics / History \$45.00
- al-Ghazzālī. **Algazel's Metaphysics.** A mediaeval translation, edited by J. T. Muckle. 1933; xx, 247 pp. ISBN -555-5.  
 Philosophy microfiche \$ 3.00
- Gilson, Etienne. **Being and Some Philosophers.** Second edition corrected and enlarged. 1952; xii, 235 pp. ISBN -401-X.  
 Philosophy \$12.50
- Kilwardby, Robert, OP. **De ortu scientiarum.** Edited by Albert G. Judy. Co-published with The British Academy; Auctores Britannici Medii Aevi, 4. 1976; lxii, 255 pp. ISBN -553-9.  
 Science \$32.00
- Maurer, Armand A., ed. **St. Thomas Aquinas 1274-1974 Commemorative Studies.** With a foreword by Etienne Gilson. 1974; 2 vols: 488, 526 pp. ISBN -551-2, 552-0.  
 Philosophy / History set \$45.00
- O'Donnell, J. Reginald, ed. **Essays in Honour of Anton Charles Pegis.** 1974; 395 pp. ISBN -550-4.  
 Philosophy / History \$29.00
- Owens, Joseph. **The Doctrine of Being in the Aristotelian *Metaphysics*: A Study in the Greek Background of Mediaeval Thought.** With a preface by Etienne Gilson. Third revised edition. 1978; xxxiii, 539 pp. ISBN -409-5.  
 Philosophy \$25.00
- Parel, Anthony, ed. **Calgary Aquinas Studies.** 1978; viii, 174 pp. ISBN -407-9.  
 Theology / History \$15.00
- Pegis, Anton Charles. **St. Thomas and the Problem of the Soul in the Thirteenth Century.** 1934; 213 pp. ISBN -406-0.  
 Theology \$14.00
- Phelan, G. B. **Selected Papers.** Edited by Arthur G. Kirn. 1967; 248 pp.  
 ISBN -405-2 hardback \$19.00  
 Philosophy ISBN -408-7 paperback \$15.00
- The Summa Parisiensis on the Decretum Gratiani.** Edited by Terence P. McLaughlin. 1952; xxxiv, 272 pp. ISBN -410-9.  
 Law: Canon microfiche \$ 4.00

## TORONTO MEDIEVAL LATIN TEXTS

- Avitus. **The Fall of Man. De spiritalis historiae gestis libri i-iii.** Edited by Daniel J. Noddes. TMLT 16. 1985; viii, 71 pp. ISBN -466-'.  
 Theology \$ 4.75

- Bartholomaeus Anglicus. **On the Properties of Soul and Body. De proprietatibus rerum libri iii et iv.** Edited by R. James Long. TMLT 9. 1979; x, 113 pp. ISBN -458-3.  
Science / Philosophy \$ 4.75
- Boccaccio. **In Defence of Poetry. Genealogiae deorum gentilium liber xiv.** Edited by Jeremiah Reedy. TMLT 8. 1978; xii, 94 pp. ISBN -457-5.  
Literary Criticism \$ 4.75
- The Canterbury Hymnal.** Edited by Gernot R. Wieland. TMLT 12. 1982; viii, 136 pp. ISBN -462-1.  
Liturgy / Hymns \$ 4.75
- The Gospel of Nicodemus. Gesta Salvatoris.** Edited by H. C. Kim. TMLT 2. 1973; x, 54 pp. ISBN -451-6.  
Apocrypha \$ 4.75
- Grosseteste, Robert. **Templum Dei.** Edited from MS 27 of Emmanuel College, Cambridge by Joseph Goering and F. A. C. Mantello. TMLT 14. 1984; viii, 92 pp. ISBN -464-8.  
Theology \$ 4.75
- Hugh Primas. **The Oxford Poems of Hugh Primas and the Arundel Lyrics.** Edited by C. J. McDonough. TMLT 15. 1984; x, 134 pp. ISBN -465-6.  
Latin Poetry \$ 4.75
- Stephen Langton. **Selected Sermons.** Edited by Phyllis B. Roberts. TMLT 10. 1980; x, 97 pp. ISBN -460-5.  
Preaching / Theology \$ 4.75
- The Life of Gundulf, Bishop of Rochester.** Edited by Rodney Thomson. TMLT 7. 1977; viii, 88 pp. ISBN -456-7.  
History / Biography \$ 4.75
- Nigel of Canterbury. **Miracles of the Virgin Mary, in Verse. Miracula Sancte Dei Genitricis Virginis Marie, versifice.** Edited by Jan Ziolkowski. TMLT 17. 1986; x, 101 pp. ISBN -467-2.  
Poetry / Mariology \$ 4.75
- Peter the Venerable. **Selected Letters.** Edited by Janet Martin in collaboration with Giles Constable. TMLT 3. 1974; viii, 107 pp. ISBN -452-4.  
Monasticism / History \$ 4.75
- Philippe de Mézières' Campaign for the Feast of Mary's Presentation.** Edited by William E. Coleman. TMLT 11. 1981; viii, 120 pp. ISBN -461-3.  
Religious Literature \$ 4.75
- The Rule of St. Benedict: The Abingdon Copy.** Edited by John Chamberlin. TMLT 13. 1982; viii, 87 pp. ISBN -463-X.  
Monasticism \$ 4.75
- A Thirteenth-Century Anthology of Rhetorical Poems.** Edited by Bruce Harbert. TMLT 4. 1975; x, 78 pp. ISBN -453-2.  
Latin Poetry \$ 4.75
- Three Latin Comedies.** Edited by Keith Bate. TMLT 6. 1976; viii, 96 pp. ISBN -455-9.  
Latin Drama \$ 4.75



PUBLICATIONS OF THE

- Three Lives of English Saints.** Edited by Michael Winterbottom. TMLT 1. 1972; x, 94 pp. ISBN -450-8.  
History: Saints \$ 4.75
- Two Alcuin Letter-Books.** Edited by Colin Chase. TMLT 5. 1975; viii, 84 pp. ISBN -454-0.  
Epistolaries / Monasticism \$ 4.75

PUBLICATIONS OF THE DICTIONARY OF OLD ENGLISH

- Dictionary of Old English. Fascicle D.** 1986; 4 fiches. ISBN -926-7.  
Old English \$ 5.95
- Venezky, Richard L. and Antonette diPaolo Healey. **A Microfiche Concordance to Old English.** PDOE 1. 1980; handbook: xviii, 201 pp., 418 fiches. ISBN -901-1.  
Old English \$175.00
- Venezky, Richard L. and Sharon Butler. **A Microfiche Concordance to Old English: The High-Frequency Words.** PDOE 2. 1985; handbooks: 24 and xviii, 201 pp., 253 fiches. ISBN -902-X.  
Old English \$150.00

*All correspondence regarding articles should be addressed to:*

The Executive Editor  
Mediaeval Studies  
59 Queen's Park Crescent East  
Toronto, Ontario  
Canada M5S 2C4

*Mediaeval Studies does not accept books for review.*

*All correspondence regarding orders and subscriptions should be addressed to:*

(from North America):

Ron B. THOMSON, D. Phil.  
Director of Publications  
59 Queen's Park Crescent East  
Toronto, Ontario  
Canada M5S 2C4

(from elsewhere):

E. J. BRILL N.V.  
Postbus 9000  
2300 PA Leiden  
The Netherlands

Subscription \$45.00 yearly. All back issues are still available.



